

ADVOCATE OF PEACE THROUGH JUSTICE

Vol. 82

APRIL, 1920

No. 4

C O N T E N T S

A Governed World.....	110
Ninety-second Annual Meeting.....	111
Editorials	
Our Constructive Foreign Policy—The Way It Actually Works—Can the Congress Declare Peace?—Financing the League of Nations— Latin-America and Arbitration—France— Syria's Claim—Increasing the Speed—Com- pulsory Military Training Defeated.....	111-120
General Articles	
Farewell Address.....	120
By GEORGE WASHINGTON	
First Inaugural Address.....	121
By THOMAS JEFFERSON	
Seventh Annual Message.....	121
By JAMES MONROE	
An American Idea of a League of Nations.....	122
By JAMES L. TRYON	
The War Has Not Destroyed—VII, The Human Struggle for a Moral Ideal.....	127
By ARTHUR DEERIN CALL	
Germany, France, and the League of Nations....	132
Congress and the Peace Treaty.....	135
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.....	136
Correspondence with Mexican Youth.....	141
International Notes.....	137
Letter Box.....	141
Book Reviews.....	141

PRICE TWENTY CENTS

A GOVERNED WORLD

The American Peace Society urges upon the American Government, and upon all civilized nations, the following principles as the hopeful bases of a governed world. It may be said that these principles and proposals have the approval of the highest authorities on international law, the Supreme Court of the United States, and practically every accredited peace society and constructive peacemaker in America.

I. THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF NATIONS.

Whereas the municipal law of civilized nations recognizes and protects the right to life, the right to liberty, the right to the pursuit of happiness, as added by the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America, the right to legal equality, the right to property, and the right to the enjoyment of the aforesaid rights; and

Whereas these fundamental rights, thus universally recognized, create a duty on the part of the peoples of all nations to observe them; and

Whereas, according to the political philosophy of the Declaration of Independence of the United States and the universal practice of the American Republics, nations or governments are regarded as created by the people, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, and are instituted among men to promote their safety and happiness and to secure to the people the enjoyment of their fundamental rights; and

Whereas the nation is a moral or juristic person, the creature of law and subordinated to law, as is the natural person in political society; and

Whereas we deem that these fundamental rights can be stated in terms of international law and applied to the relations of the members of the society of nations, one with another, just as they have been applied in the relations of the citizens or subjects of the States forming the society of nations; and

Whereas these fundamental rights of national jurisprudence, namely, the right to life, the right to liberty, the right to the pursuit of happiness, the right to equality before the law, the right to property, and the right to the observance thereof, are, when stated in terms of international law, the right of the nation to exist and to protect and to conserve its existence; the right of independence and the freedom to develop itself without interference or control from other nations; the right of equality in law and before law; the right to territory within defined boundaries and to exclusive jurisdiction therein, and the right to the observance of these fundamental rights; and

Whereas the rights and the duties of nations are, by virtue of membership in the society thereof, to be exercised and performed in accordance with the exigencies of their mutual interdependence expressed in the preamble to the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes of the First and Second Hague Peace Conferences, recognizing the solidarity which unites the members of the society of civilized nations, it should therefore be universally maintained by the nations and peoples of the world, that:

I. Every nation has the right to exist and to protect and to conserve its existence, but this right neither implies the right nor justifies the act of the State to protect itself or to conserve its existence by the commission of unlawful acts against innocent and unoffending States.

II. Every nation has the right to independence in the sense that it has a right to the pursuit of happiness and is free to develop itself without interference or control from other States, provided that in so doing it does not interfere with or violate the rights of other States.

III. Every nation is in law and before law the equal of every other nation belonging to the society of nations, and all nations have the right to claim and, according to the Declaration of Independence of the United States, "to assume, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's god entitle them."

IV. Every nation has the right to territory within defined boundaries and to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over its territory and all persons, whether native or foreign, found therein.

V. Every nation entitled to a right by the law of nations is entitled to have that right respected and protected by all other nations, for right and duty are correlative, and the right of one is the duty of all to observe.

VI. International law is at one and the same time both national and international; national in the sense that it is the law of the land and applicable as such to the decision of all questions involving its principles; international in the sense that it is the law of the society of nations and applicable as such to all questions between and among the members of the society of nations involving its principles.

II. AN INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM FOR PEACE THROUGH JUSTICE.

1. The call of a Third Hague Conference, to which every country belonging to the society of nations shall be invited and in whose proceedings every such country shall participate.

2. A stated meeting of the Hague Peace Conference, which, thus meeting at regular, stated periods, will become a recommending if not a law-making body.

3. An agreement of the States forming the society of nations concerning the call and procedure of the Conference, by which that institution shall become not only internationalized, but in which no nation shall take as of right a preponderating part.

4. The appointment of a committee, to meet at regular intervals between the conferences, charged with the duty of procuring the ratification of the conventions and declarations and of calling attention to the conventions and declarations in order to insure their observance.

5. An understanding upon certain fundamental principles of international law, as set forth in the declaration of the rights and duties of nations adopted by the American Institute of International Law on January 6, 1916, which are themselves based upon decisions of English courts and of the Supreme Court of the United States.

6. The creation of an international council of conciliation to consider, to discuss, and to report upon such questions of a non-justiciable character as may be submitted to such council by an agreement of the powers for this purpose.

7. The employment of good offices, mediation, and friendly composition for the settlement of disputes of a non-justiciable nature.

8. The principle of arbitration in the settlement of disputes of a non-justiciable nature; also of disputes of a justiciable nature which should be decided by a court of justice, but which have, through delay or mismanagement, assumed such political importance that the nations prefer to submit them to arbiters of their own choice rather than to judges of a permanent judicial tribunal.

9. The negotiation of a convention creating a judicial union of the nations along the lines of the Universal Postal Union of 1906, to which all civilized nations and self-governing dominions are parties, pledging the good faith of the contracting parties to submit their justiciable disputes—that is to say, their differences involving law or equity—to a permanent court of this union, whose decisions will bind not only the litigating nations, but also all parties to its creation.

10. The creation of an enlightened public opinion in behalf of peaceable settlement in general, and in particular in behalf of the foregoing nine propositions, in order that, if agreed to, they may be put into practice and become effective, in response to the appeal to that greatest of sanctions, "a decent respect to the opinion of mankind."

Advocate of Peace

VOL. 82

APRIL, 1920

NUMBER 4

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DERRIN CALL

Assist. Editor, GEO. P. MORRIS

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

(1815-1828)

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable Address, "Ampax, Washington")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate Subscription Price, \$1.50 a year. Single copies, twenty cents each.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized August 10, 1918.

OUR NINETY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING

An Announcement

THE Ninety-second Annual Meeting of the American Peace Society will be held in Washington, Saturday, May 29. At the dinner on the evening of that day, we are pleased to announce, there will be an annual address dealing with the enduring bases of foreign policy, an address which all will recognize as authoritative. It may be added that by having such an annual address the Society is returning to a custom which made the American Peace Society famous before the Civil War. In other words, the address will be in the apostolic line of Ralph Waldo Emerson, who delivered his essay on "War" before the American Peace Society in 1838; of William Ellery Channing; of Charles Sumner, who delivered the annual address in 1849; and of other notable addresses by such men as William Jay, Josiah Quincy, A. P. Peabody, Gerrit Smith, Samuel J. May, Amasa Walker, Thomas C. Upham, Elihu Burritt, Thomas S. Grimke, William Ladd. This particular annual address, coming at this time, will undoubtedly attract attention and influence opinion not only in this country but abroad.

The regular meeting of the Executive Committee of the American Peace Society will be held at the Society's headquarters Friday, the 28th. The Board of Directors will meet at the same place Saturday morning, May 29, at 10.30, when the usual reports will be made and the officers elected. Members of the Society wishing to attend the dinner, the price of which will not exceed \$5.00, are asked to notify the Secretary at the earliest possible time.

THE SECRETARY.

OUR CONSTRUCTIVE FOREIGN POLICY

IN OUR leading editorial for November, 1919, we argued for a conference of all the nations as the way out of our present difficulties due to the entanglements over the League of Nations. The views there expressed have reappeared in magazines both in this country and Europe.

There are evidences that such views are finding lodgment in fruitful soil in the fields of practical politics. February 20 the Republican Party of the State of New York adopted in its platform a plank calling for the institution of an International High Court of Justice to hear and to decide international justiciable questions in accordance with principles of law and equity, an international conference meeting at stated intervals to revise the rules of international law and conduct, "and to urge upon the civilized nations, as a long step forward in promoting permanent peace, their assent to such a code of law defining the rights and duties of nations, such as was adopted by the American Institute of International Law at Havana, Republic of Cuba, on January 23, 1917, known as the Recommendations of Havana." The Recommendations of Havana are the ten paragraphs under the caption, "An International Program of Peace Through Justice," appearing regularly on the inside front cover of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* since our entry into the war.

April 10 Governor Lowden, of Illinois, his State's candidate for the Republican nomination for President, delivered a speech in Chicago, in which he advocated the abandonment of many of the principles of the League of Nations and urged the resumption of the workings of the Hague Conference, providing the necessary judicial machinery for the settlement of international disputes. The Governor said:

"When the war was over," said Governor Lowden, "the whole world was in a state of suspense as to what might happen after war. During those strenuous months of struggle, when the flower of our young manhood was offering itself upon the battlefields of Europe, it was hoped that in some way out of that colossal conflict might come a better understanding, better international relations, with the possibility of less frequent wars for the future. So to many of us it seemed that the time was ripe for taking up the work of The Hague International conferences, providing for judicial machinery for the settlement of international disputes, codifying international law so far as it was possible, bringing about closer relations between the nations, to the end that peace might prevail among the nations of the earth.

"I have always felt that we overlooked the opportunity of a lifetime in that we did not take up the great work of The Hague conferences where they left off and go on to the creation of international courts, so that we might arbitrate our international differences rather than fight them out on bloody battlefields.

"We are in favor of peace; we want the friendship of every nation on the face of the globe; we are looking for friends, but we are not looking for partners. We prefer to maintain our own independence and preserve our own sovereignty under the dome of our own Capitol at Washington.

"I still hope that when the Republican Party is in power we shall proceed to establish this machinery for the adjustment of international differences. I still hope that the Republican Party will have the wisdom and the courage to take up the great work of The Hague conferences, and carry that work on until the wars of the future shall be reduced to a minimum."

Here we have sane views from an influential quarter. They are views destined to fructify increasingly. We are informed that the supporters of Governor Lowden agree that an international conference in the future could not fail to prevent war, as was the case in 1914, because of the prestige of America, of the experiences since 1914, and of the patent need of just that kind of an organization. Senator Hiram Johnson, another presidential possibility, in an address delivered in Paterson, N. J., April 8, also declared that he would "welcome an expansion of the Hague tribunal or an international forum." For such practical matters as adjusting the chaotic conditions of exchange, plans have been perfected for a conference of representative financiers from all the nations to be held within a month in the city of Brussels. Surely the details of international equities and of international law outside the realms of finance are no less practical, pressing, or amenable to similar treatment. If international finance can be regulated only by a conference of representatives of all the nations, the same thing must be true of international trade, of international law, and hence of international peace.

Now is the time for constructive effort in the interest of a genuine and practicable foreign policy, a foreign policy true to the traditions of America's best. To our readers we plead for the widest dissemination of what that best means, for it is very pertinent just now to the future of the world. And this best is not hard to find. Neither is it strange nor difficult to understand. The *ADVOCATE* offers no apology for presenting in this number the three significant expressions from three significant men of a significant past, for our constructive foreign policy of the future must develop from that very successful foreign policy of a most wise and honorable past.

THE WAY IT ACTUALLY WORKS

GREAT BRITAIN is a member of the League of Nations, Article X and all. This has been true since January 10 last. It is therefore of interest to make inquiry of Britain's success in promoting the peace of the world under its provisions. In a recent debate in the House of Commons, when the army estimates were up for discussion, it was pointed out that the new regular army is altogether insufficient for the defense of the "new empire." It was pointed out that the obligations which Great Britain has accepted as mandatory for the League of Nations would have to be met, and that under Article X of the Covenant it was the duty of Great Britain to go to the assistance of any member of the League who might find itself in trouble. Hence there must be a larger army and navy than ever for Britain.

When we remember that the new regular army of Great Britain is 200,000 stronger than the regular army before the war, these facts seem of still more significance.

When it is recalled that the object of warring with Germany was to crush Prussian militarism, after which we could all then live without carrying upon our shoulders the overpowering armies and navies; when we recall that the Covenant of the League of Nations was to make the way simple for the disarmament of the nations; when we recall that with the Germans being defeated, arbitration was to put an end to combat, it is interesting to note this demand out of Great Britain for the greatest defensive force in her history. Mr. Churchill, with eyes open to the facts, realizes that there are more dangers of war now than in 1914. The imperial schemes of Britain, seemingly enhanced under the Covenant, demand the use of an increased force, we are told, along the frontiers and in the Asiatic wars. Thus the Covenant of the League of Nations seems to promote that very imperialism which is the mother of wars. There is no getting around the fact that under the terms of the Covenant Britain is proceeding to keep peoples in subjection by military force, with the result that instead of the danger of militarism being less in Britain than before the war, it is greater. That is the way it works.

In the meantime, it is interesting to note, the Germans have taken hold of their militarists and gently thrown them down the back stairs. April 11, there was received in Paris a statement from a member of the Executive Council at Düsseldorf containing these suggestive words:

"The soldiers of the Reichswehr are brigands and mercenaries. We prefer the coming of the Allies' troops to the Reichswehr. The treaty was too severe on us Germans in

an economic way, but not severe enough in the military clauses, for the Germans themselves want to be rid of militarists."

That is the way it works in a nation outside the League of Nations. Such are our manners and our times.

CAN THE CONGRESS DECLARE PEACE?

CONGRESS can declare war. Can Congress declare peace? At this writing, that is the problem facing the United States.

Congress is proceeding to act on the theory that it has the power, for on the second anniversary declaring the existence of war between the Imperial German Government and the United States—that is to say, April 6—the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives reported a joint resolution providing for the termination of a state of war between this country and Germany, permitting under certain conditions the resumption of reciprocal trade with Germany, and for other purposes.

Our belief is that Congress should have, and in fact does have, the right to declare peace. True, war is ordinarily ended either by the utter subjugation of one of the two contesting parties, or by treaty. In this case the tried and familiar method would be, as we have attempted twice unsuccessfully to do, namely, to establish the peace by treaty. If we were to pursue that method, we would have to proceed under that section of the Constitution which vests the treaty-making power in the President and the Senate. Under that section of the Constitution, treaty is not defined, neither is any class of treaties withdrawn. The presumption is, however, and always has been, that all treaties between the United States and other countries are to be made by the President and the Senate—that is to say, negotiated by the President or his authorized agents and submitted by the President to the Senate for its advice and consent to their ratification.

There are two points of view from which a treaty may be considered: First, from the point of view that it is a law; secondly, from the point of view that it is a contract. Article VI of the Constitution provides that "this Constitution, and the laws of the United States . . . and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."

As far as the United States is concerned, a treaty is a law. As such, it repeals all existing laws contrary to its terms, and is itself repealed by any law or subsequent treaty inconsistent with its terms. Considered as law,

a treaty only has force and effect within the jurisdiction of the enacting country, being thus quite outside the jurisdiction of any other country. As such, it is a national and unilateral act.

But from the point of view that a treaty is a contract, it is a bilateral act, requiring two or more parties, upon both of whom it is binding because of their mutual consent to it. Differing from the contract of municipal law, the consent may be voluntary or imposed. It is an international act, having force and effect within the jurisdiction of the parties thereto, whereas an act of Congress, whether it be an ordinary statute or a joint resolution, has only force and effect of law within the United States. A treaty to which we are a party has force and effect within the United States and in the other contracting country or countries. As far as the United States is concerned, a law or treaty has equal force within the jurisdiction of the United States; and, as the last expression of the sovereign will, whether it be expressed in treaty, statute, or resolution, it is binding on all citizens of the United States. A treaty of peace between the United States and another country, with which the United States is at war, ends the war, because the treaty has the force and effect of a statute and as such repeals the former act of Congress declaring the condition of war to exist. If the United States is to end the war by treaty, then such treaty must be negotiated by the President and advised and consented to by two-thirds of the Senators present.

But by the practice and law of nations, which is a part of the law of our land, war is ended in ways other than by treaty. If a war is not ended by treaty, an act of Congress, as the latest expression of the sovereign will, may end war. This means that war may be ended by the United States with another country without the formality of a treaty. For example, it has been held in an unbroken series of decisions (from the Prize Cases, in 2 Black's Reports, 635, to *Young, assignee of Collie*, in 97 U. S. Reports, 39) that the Civil War in all hostile operations must be regarded as an international war (*Stovall, adm'r, v. U. S.*, 1891, 26 Ct. Cl., 226, 240). Yet, as stated by Mr. Justice Grier, in the Prize Cases (2 Black, 668), decided in 1862:

"By the Constitution Congress alone has the power to declare a national or foreign war. It cannot declare war against a State, or any number of States, by virtue of any clause in the Constitution."

But the Civil War, universally regarded as a war in the international sense, and in which the nations of the world proclaimed their neutrality, was not ended by a treaty. It ended not by treaty, but by proclamation (*The Protector*, 1871, 12 Wallace, 700).

In a war between two States which resulted in the absorption of one by the other, it would necessarily end without a treaty. The war might continue in theory, although not in fact, because of the impossibility of concluding a treaty. But even where a treaty is possible, but has not been made, war is ended between the belligerent countries by a mere failure to continue hostilities. This method of ending war is recognized by the United States in a comparatively recent and famous case.

Secretary of State Seward laid down the general principle and applied it within the narrow compass of a couple of paragraphs.

In the first, he said:

"It is certain that a condition of war can be raised without an authoritative declaration of war, and, on the other hand, the situation of peace may be restored by the long suspension of hostilities without a treaty of peace being made. History is full of such occurrences. What period of suspension of war is necessary to justify the presumption of the restoration of peace has never yet been settled, and must in every case be determined with reference to collateral facts and circumstances." (Moore's International Law Digest, Vol. VII, p. 336.)

In the second:

"The proceeds of Spain and Chili which have been referred to, although conclusive, require an explanation on the part of either of those powers which shall insist that the condition of war still exists. Peru, equally with Spain, has as absolute a right to decline the good offices or mediation of the United States for peace, as either has to accept the same. The refusal of either would be inconclusive as an evidence of determination to resume or continue the war. It is the interest of the United States, and of all nations, that the return of peace, however it may be brought about, shall be accepted whenever it has become clearly established. Whenever the United States shall find itself obliged to decide the question whether the war still exists between Spain and Peru, or whether that war has come to an end, it will make that decision only after having carefully examined all the pertinent facts which shall be within its reach, and after having been given due consideration to such representation as shall have been made by the several parties interested." (Moore's International Law Digest, Vol. VII, pp. 336-377.)

It is true that the present situation is unusual. In the present case hostilities with Germany ceased on November 11, 1918, by an armistice to which the United States was a party. The other belligerents formally concluded peace with Germany on January 10, 1920, by deposit of ratifications of the Treaty of Versailles. The United States was a party to this treaty. But the Senate has twice refused to advise and consent to its ratification (November 19, 1919; March 19, 1920). The United States is, therefore, technically at war with Germany, although hostilities are suspended. This situa-

tion has lasted for approximately seventeen months, and there seems to be no intention on the part of either belligerent to denounce the armistice and begin hostilities. A joint resolution of the Congress, expressing an intent that the war has ended or will be considered as ended on a certain date, will, under actual circumstances, merely register or recognize a fact. It would not be a treaty, inasmuch as it would only bind the United States and would not bind Germany at one and the same time, as would a treaty to which the United States and Germany were ratifying parties.

But while the situation with us is peculiar, it is not wholly without precedent. The United States and the Republic of Texas concluded a treaty on April 12, 1844, by virtue of which Texas was to be annexed to the United States. June 8, 1844, the Senate refused to advise and consent to the treaty. The purpose of the contracting parties was accomplished by a joint resolution of the United States Congress, adopted March 1, 1845. Speaking with reference to this treaty, the then Secretary of State, Mr. John C. Calhoun, stated that the purpose sought to be effected by the treaty could be accomplished by a joint resolution, which would have the advantage of requiring only a majority of the two Houses of Congress instead of two-thirds of the Senate. It would seem, therefore, that there are methods other than of the treaty by which war may be terminated.

Opponents of this method have pointed out that the Federal Convention of 1787 voted down a proposal to have peace declared by the Congress, and that, therefore, war can be ended constitutionally only by a treaty of peace negotiated by the President, advised and consented to by two-thirds of the Senate.

As we have seen, however, war may be ended in other ways than by treaty. This is an established principle of international law, which international law is recognized by the United States as a part of its municipal law. For this reason the United States is free to end war in a manner other than by treaty.

But the action of the Convention of 1787 has been misinterpreted. In the session of August 17, 1787, Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, moved "to give the legislature the power of peace, as they were to have that of war." Mr. Butler's motion, seconded by Mr. Gerry, was voted down by the ten States participating in the vote; but, we may recall, the power also of the legislature to grant a charter of incorporation was, on the 14th of September, proposed and rejected. And yet, in spite of this fact, the Supreme Court approved the incorporation of the Bank of the United States in the leading case of *McCulloch v. Maryland*, in 1819 (4 Wheaton, 316), reaffirmed in what may be considered to be an appeal from

this decision in *Osborn v. Bank of the United States*, 1824 (9 Wheaton, 738). The point of this is that, since it was thus established that the bank was incidental to the power of raising revenue, the power to end war, the avowed purpose of which is to establish peace, would seem to be incidental to the war power itself.

But the principal point to be borne in mind is that under international law war may be ended without a treaty, and international law is a part of our law. In the case known as *Paquette Habana*, 175 U. S., 677, 700, decided in 1899, it was held:

"International law is a part of our law and must be ascertained and administered by the courts of justice of appropriate jurisdiction, as often as questions of right depending upon it are duly presented for their determination."

This very point of view seems to have been foreseen by Mr. Madison, who in 1787 proposed in the session of September 7 of the Federal Convention that treaties of peace should be made by less than a two-thirds vote and without the concurrence of the President. As reported by himself, he said:

"The President would necessarily derive so much power and importance from a state of war that he might be tempted, if authorized, to impede a treaty of peace."

If, as in the case of Texas, a joint resolution of the two Houses was found to be an acceptable and effective substitute for a treaty which had failed, it would seem that in the case of Germany a joint resolution might likewise be found to be an acceptable and effective substitute for a treaty which has twice failed.

It seems to us that the explanations accompanying the joint resolution now before the House are both germane and convincing. Undoubtedly, as pointed out by Oppenheim, Phillipson, and Mr. Seward, wars may be terminated otherwise than by treaty. Since this is so, the Congress seems now to be headed in the right direction, and the end of the technical state of war between the United States and Germany seems to be in sight.

FINANCING THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

NOT being a member of the League of Nations, the United States as yet has not had to face any of the fiscal and administrative problems involved in its maintenance; but, of course, nations that have joined it must now be meeting these practical, if lesser, aspects of its functioning.

We had supposed that the normal course in meeting this need would be similar to that followed by the Pan-American Union. In that case direct appropriations from the national treasuries of the countries represented

follow as a matter of course year by year. Certainly it is not to be presumed that a league of nations is to be financed by the voluntary offerings of citizens of the countries admitted; nor, once constituted and formally adhered to by any nation, should there be any necessity of a private organization to work in propaganda ways for maintenance of the League. Whatever discussion of the merit of adherence to or of the desirability of withdrawal may follow, surely it will go on in the national legislature or be reflected in executive utterances.

This comment is suggested by an appeal of the League of Nations' Union of Great Britain for a national fund of \$500,000 to support the League. It is signed by Premier Lloyd-George, Viscount Grey, former Premier Asquith, Lord Robert Cecil, and J. R. Clydes, the leader of the trades-unionists. Surely no such sum is needed for an educational campaign, now or in the future. If it is, then the British public can hardly be as unanimous for the League as it has been said to be.

LATIN-AMERICA AND ARBITRATION

ON PAGE — we print the text of a communication to the States of Central and of South America planned to be sent by Salvador.

Were its origin different, it would be subject to more detailed examination by the people of the United States and their government than it is now likely to receive. Brazil, the Argentine Republic, or Chile sending forth such a call would have a far more weighty effect. Yet the fact remains that it has yet to be proved that Salvador is not acting for the larger Latin-American powers, who have sent out this feeler to note its effect in Washington. It indicates a state of mind rebellious against the reiterated intention of the United States to continue to assert the Monroe Doctrine in its most paternal rather than fraternal form.

More specifically analyzed, the Salvadorian plan is interesting, because of the stress it puts upon juridical methods of settling all disputes between the Latin-American nations—a process that involves creation of a court competent to deal with any issues that may come before it. The Latin-American is not a lover of war. He has memories of his long struggle against Spain, which so decimated the Iberian stock in some of the countries that they never have functioned efficiently as they otherwise might. The Latin-American recalls the innumerable "revolutions" that have characterized the historical development of South American republicanism down to a comparatively recent time. He knows that these factional fights, involving loss of life, have been disastrous economically as well as politically. He wants an end put to civil war.

The next step is easy, and he takes it. He dislikes to think of the Americas passing through any such "reconstruction" experience as Europe has had since 1914. Therefore he now pleads for resort to reason, not to force, to trained investigators of facts and not to rhetorical partisans and beaters of the drums of war. Having created his judicial and arbitral tribunal, he wants it to hold its sessions on soil conquered and held by Latins. If there is to be a Pan-America capital, he wants it to be nearer the regions where Latins dominate.

This is a straw that it will be well to watch float down the stream of time. Races that have produced a Drago of the Argentine and a Barbosa of Brazil need not dread experimenting with their own system of league formation for juridical ends.

At a time when neither Europe nor the United States seem to have much vital faith in an international court competent to deal with international disputes, and thus to avoid wars, it is refreshing to see Latin-America considering what its policy is to be.

FRANCE

AFTER the experiences following August 1, 1914, it is natural to expect evidence of nervousness in France. We have no doubt that the speech by the former Premier, Jean Louis Barthou, March 26, delivered in the Chamber of Deputies during a discussion of French foreign policy, expressed views widely current not only in France, but in England also. It is probably true that French merchants are interested in the cotton of Adana and in the oil of Mosul, in consequence of which there is a real bone of contention between France and England, and that is Syria. It is a familiar fact that, while France breasted Germany during those distressful years, England was overthrowing the Turks in Asia Minor and laying the ground for claims to the vast reservoirs of wealth in that section of the world. This is a fact to be considered in any attempt to analyze the present strained relations between France and England. But let it not be overlooked that France has suffered; still suffers. It may be true, as the Deputy Minister of Public Works, M. Le Trocquer, says, that Great Britain has promised France, out of the English stock of coal available for disposal, 60 per cent, instead of the 20 previously promised, and that at a special price; but the fact remains that the treaty guaranteeing English and American protection for France along the east is a dead letter. While England has obtained security by the destruction of the German fleet, it is also a fact that, as M. Barthou said, "France stands alone." This ought not to be so. We are convinced that France is not a militaristic nation, and that she desires no conquests;

but we are also clearly convinced that France feels the justice of her demand that she should be reimbursed for the losses which have come to her as a result of the ruthless attack across her industrial areas. France is entitled to reparation. We all said this during the war. It was provided for in the treaty ending the war. We should not forget it now. Our view is that France should obtain these reparations in discussion with the Allies if possible, and that she will receive them that way; but, failing this now, we find it difficult to criticise her for moving her troops across the Rhine. It is wholly unjust that England should be credited with all the generosity toward Germany, and that France should be charged with all the sternness toward that arch aggressor. That is not fair to France. France has grievances well known and justified. The French are intelligent, free of sentimentalism, interested in realities, and swift to execute ideas. It is natural, after the experiences of this war, after the failure of Germany to fulfill her engagements, and in the light of the history of a thousand years, that France should desire to know where she stands and that there should be a Nationalist Party favoring military occupation of the Ruhr basin. In the absence of any agreed evidence of support from the outside, it is easy to understand why France should take upon herself the enforcement of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. We confess to a feeling of pride and sympathy with the former Premier when he said: "Great Britain knows how to defend her interests. France is still strong enough to defend herself with her allies if they agree and without them if they withdraw." That utterance was dignified, justified, French. It is said that the Frenchman is conceited only as regards France. There is nothing, certainly, of the American brag and bunkum in him. The utterance of M. Barthou was not sharp or stridulous. It was out of the Frenchman in him. The one thing the French may be expected to do is to stand by *La Patrie*. The five years of war will reach their climax of infamy if, deprived of protection from further attacks on her east, France, *la duce France*, is left alone to obtain those reparations agreed to by all the belligerents in the Treaty of Versailles.

SYRIA'S CLAIM

ONE of the most dramatic, and for a time disturbing, incidents of the month has been the assertion by Prince Feisul of autonomy of an Arabian State in Syria, his elevation to the headship of the same, and his defiance of Great Britain and France in their determination to partition territory nominally Turkish but which the Arabs now claim must be ruled by Arabs.

Proceeding to Paris following his assertion of his

people's claims, Feisal has been dealing with the representatives of France, and his latest utterances indicate some modification of his insistence. What these claims originally were may be inferred from the appeal which he sent to President Wilson and the Government of the United States. It said:

"The Arab district, namely, Syria, including Palestine, Hedjaz, and Mesopotamia, which has suffered for centuries under Turkish misrule, unable to get justice, has revolted against the Caliph's call and rendered the call of Islam for a holy war void in the Mohammedan world.

"This was done by the Arabs for a realization of the aspirations and rights which the Allies, especially Great Britain, acknowledged and promised to secure for us. The principles laid down by you were gladly accepted by the Allies, who admitted that the war was one of liberation and not of conquest. The liberated nations, especially Syria, were assured that they would be given the right to choose the power they desired to assist them in government.

"The Arabs rushed into the World War upon these principles, in full confidence of the clear promises of the Allies that the Arabs would be given liberty. After the armistice, a secret treaty, unknown to the Arabs, divided Syria into four zones, under different administrations, which made the population furious. But public excitement was quieted by assurances that these divisions were temporary, and that they would vanish with the military government.

"Because of the great danger of having all Syria inflamed into insurrection, it was necessary to call a constituent assembly, elected by the nation, which proclaimed the country's independence and elected me chief, thus assuring peace to the country, which conforms to the promises and declarations of the Allies.

"We want only our rights, conferred by nature and by our great sacrifices in the war. We entertain the hope that the Allies will receive our new regulations with pleasure and endeavor to remove the obstacles which might hinder our progress. We desire nothing except to live peacefully in a peaceful world. Owing to the present situation, I hope you will assist us in defending our case and render a decision in conformity with your principles.

"We intend to safeguard the interests of the Allies in our country and protect the rights of all foreigners. The definitely arranged division of Syria into various parts is detrimental to our national life. It is impossible, for both political and economic reasons, to have peace without liberty and unity."

INCREASING THE SPEED

THE BIG BERTHAS bombarded Paris from a distance of approximately seventy-five miles. A French lieutenant, Delamare-Maze, has invented a contrivance by which it will be possible to double the range of guns of the pattern of the Big Berthas. It is reported that the velocity of the shell will be increased from 2,625 feet to 4,625 feet a second and the range lengthened to 150 miles. This is evidently a serious matter, for the French Government has purchased the patent. There-

fore this instrument of destruction is a thing to be reckoned with.

So the merry game goes on. Shortly there will be practically no limit to the destruction possible to life and property which an enemy will be able to inflict. As the *London Times* complains in its number for April 2:

"London, for instance, could be bombarded by batteries of new guns stationed at Zeebrugge or mounted on ships cruising far from land in the North Sea; and at the same time be bombed by a fleet of thousands of airplanes carrying far heavier supplies of far more destructive explosives than anything yet seen. The prospects, especially for big towns, which would certainly be the first objectives to be attacked, is appalling. Whole areas would be wiped out, with their human populations, and it is conceivable that an unscrupulous power, making an unjustified attack, might so take its intended victim by surprise as to end the war almost before it began. . . . War is destined to become a much more serious menace than it has been to the prosperity and happiness of the world."

Yes, that is the plain fact.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING DEFEATED

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES on February 25 so reacted to the report of its Committee on Military Affairs, favoring compulsory military training of the youth of the land, that it was decided to eliminate the section from the army bill, for which the House later stood sponsor.

In the Senate friends of compulsory training also controlled the Committee on Military Affairs, and hence the Senate's army bill included provisions making the compulsory system operative in 1921, at a cost which, at the lowest, meant not less than \$700,000,000 a year.

Debate of this bill and its section for continuing in times of peace the system used in "the selective service" of the "World War" opened early in April, Senator Wadsworth, of New York, championing the measure, and Senator McKellar, of Tennessee, attacking it. Two days' debate indicated so clearly that the plan for setting up conscription in the United States could not pass through the Senate as at present constituted and with world conditions as they now are, that it was agreed to drop the section fixing the system on the nation. The proposed increase of the military forces, it was decided, is to be left to the voluntary action of individuals, for whom special provisions are to be made in the way of military training and general and vocational education at specified times and regular seasons.

It was in vain that champions of the compulsory system cited, with more or less justification, the claim that the President and the Secretary of War favored the

compulsory plan. Opponents, with equal facility of quotation, showed that the President also had called upon his party followers in Congress to postpone definite decision on so important a matter until the world condition altered and it was clear just what the military policy of the country should be.

The decisive defeat of the party of "compulsion" is due, in our opinion, to three facts:

First. Much of the evidence accumulated by Congress relative to the conduct of the war, the treatment suffered by privates and subordinate officers, and the caste spirit of the "regular" officers has made it impossible to get some of the lawmakers to support any plan which forces youth into a life that is prophetic during days of peace of such experiences in time of war.

Second. A very large proportion of the men who formed the A. E. F. and a much larger proportion of their kinsfolk, who have had a chance to study the war's effect upon the youths who went forth, are, as voters, dead set against America taking up with a policy that has cursed Europe and that England already has indicated she dare not continue. These voters, old and new, who are to shape largely the outcome of the coming elections, have let lawmakers know what they want and what they do not want; and the lawmakers have obeyed their intimations.

Third. The wisest of the party leaders and the most statesmanlike of the legislators, facing a deficit of from \$3,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000 in the national accounts for the present fiscal year and knowing that the people are muttering and preparing to punish parties or persons who add anything to the taxes dared not propose adding an item of expenditure that, at a minimum estimate, meant an increase of \$700,000,000 a year. To do so meant personal, political suicide, and also would handicap their party in the coming election. Arguments as to the necessity of "preparedness" against foes abroad—named or suspected—had no effect on this group of opportunists.

That other motives influenced some of the Senators we doubt not. We have confined our comment to three that we know had weight. But it would be unfair to seem to intimate that all the votes were prudential and based on policy or on knowledge recently acquired and specially applicable to these times. Some Senators voted because of deep-rooted moral conviction that once the militarist camel got his nose under the flap of the tent he would never be dislodged. They had had all their beliefs respecting the unfortunate effects of enforced life in barracks and under the discipline of absolutists confirmed by the testimony of the youths who made the best records in the "selective service." They

did not and they do not believe that the army is the best school for American youth, however illiterate, physically defective, or without institutional civic morale they may be. These Senators voted for a voluntary system with a clear conscience, as the lesser of two evils. But neither the Germany of yesterday nor the France of today is their model State for America to copy.

THE publication by Mr. Roosevelt's literary executor in *Scribner's Magazine* of much of the correspondence between the former President and the sovereigns of Europe is enabling his countrymen to see how much he did in the way of shaping the national foreign policy without taking the public into his confidence. Thus, in connection with the Algeiras conference, it is claimed by Mr. Roosevelt that at the solicitation of the then Kaiser he promoted the calling of the conference; that he, Roosevelt, drew up the terms of settlement which were adopted, and that he "fairly compelled the Kaiser to give his unwilling consent to them." Here is a clue that we would like to see followed up by some investigator. It shows the United States, by executive action exclusively, sharing in shaping European and African policy.

GOOD sense respecting study of German in the schools was shown by the House of Representatives, March 29, when considering the District of Columbia appropriation bill. As reported from the committee, none of the money set apart for the Washington schools was to be paid to any teacher imparting instruction in the German language. But "the war is over, and the sooner we admit it the greater self-respect we will have in future years," said Congressman Mann, who led a successful fight to have this provision stricken out of the bill.

IN THE March number of the *ADVOCATE* we called attention to the action of the Senate of the University of Berlin in punishing Prof. G. F. Nicolai, author of "The Biology of War," because of his candor during the war in pointing out the baneful effects of militarism upon German national life, resulting in her present defeat and disaster. We noted that he seemed inclined to come hitherward to find academic freedom. It is a pleasure to be able to chronicle that the Prussian Minister of Education at once rebuked the Berlin University Senate; insisted that Professor Nicolai should be conceded all his rights; and informed the Senate that the Department fully intended to protect academic freedom in the universities.

MEXICO'S government has sent a commission to the United States to study the working of the Boy Scout movement, intending to use the material gathered in drafting a law that will make the Boy Scouts of Mexico subservient to the Department of War and a distinct part of the military arm of the republic. Is this the logic of the premises on which the argument for the Boy Scout movement is based?

ECUADOR and Colombia recently came to an agreement on a boundary dispute. On April 4 the fact was made the occasion of a fête day in both countries. Moreover, the presidents of the two countries proceeded to the frontier, and while national hymns were played by bands and while military contingents of the two countries saluted each other, the cornerstone of a monument commemorating the event was laid. They do things admirably in Latin America, with due regard for symbolism and civic ritualism and their subtle effect on national psychology.

THE only woman seeking for nomination and election to the United States Senate, Miss Anne Martin, of Nevada, is opposed to the Treaty of Versailles; is in favor of a league of peace of all nations; would restore the pre-war rights of free speech, press, and assembly; would release all political prisoners and conscientious objectors, and would tax war-made millionaires to pay the costs of the war. Ozonic clarity this, anyhow.

EASTER DAY in Jerusalem saw a fight, with 188 casualties, mostly minor; but all symbolical of that "state of peace" which exists not only in the Sacred City of Jew, Christian, Moslem, and modern Zionist, but in the world at large as well.

M. ANDRÉ TARDIEU, French High Commissioner in the United States during the war and one of the Peace Commissioners at the Quai D'Orsay, renders a service by calling upon the French people to oppose the anti-American campaign in France. It is, as he says, both "dangerous and absurd." We of America, on the other hand, can never forget what France was to us over a century ago, or her unforgettable heroism along the Marne, the Yser, at Verdun. How can any American forget that along those terrible stretches countless French boys bared their breasts to German bullets until America could arrive? Mr. Wilson should speak no unkind word of France. We agree with M. Tardieu that, "having had the privilege of presiding

over these efforts on both sides of the ocean, I have the right to say that the service mutually rendered and received witnesses the great ability for collaboration of the two nations." Let the federation of the Boy Scouts of America with the Boy Scouts of France go on. Let the interchange between schools take place. As this French official adds, "If the two republics fail to draw from war and peace the mutual benefits they should, they will be unworthy of their past and unworthy of their future."

THE HISTORIAN of the "World War" in all its phases may have to come to the United States for material; for, with characteristic enterprise and lavish expenditure of funds, some of our universities and some of our private citizens have seen to it that data of all sorts should be gathered abroad and at home, suitably housed, and put in shape for quick and informing use by investigators. Princeton University, for instance, is said to have a collection that already numbers 1,000,000 titles if articles in periodicals are included. For this she owes a debt of gratitude to two alumni, one of them a governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Harvard and Yale are in the same class of collectors and are planning to collaborate with Princeton, so as to avoid undue duplication. Princeton is specializing in international law and economics.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY of the delegates of the peace societies will be held in Europe under the auspices of the Bureau International de la Paix, Berne, May 22. This meeting should be of interest, especially in the light of the opposition from certain quarters to the resolution adopted September last by the Council, fixing the responsibility of the war upon Germany; also in the light of the fact that there is a growing opinion that a constructive program for the union of the peace workers should not suffer again its fate of 1914.

TESTIMONY from British, Canadian, and American social welfare workers and from officials who have to administer relief funds and deal with the consequences of marital differences is virtually unanimous that a comparatively small number of the war-time marriages are proving to be happy or permanent unions. The disillusionment that comes with peace, its duties, its grim realities, its recurrence to such old-fashioned affairs as maternity, family support, and adjustment of temperaments and tempers, is proving hard for thousands of women and men who allowed the romantic aspects of war to set aside the safeguards of reason. This difficulty of substituting for the allurements of

khaki the reality of homespun is not confined to privates' and subordinate officers' war brides. It reaches up into the ranks of the higher officers and the women war workers in high administrative positions. Nor, since we are alluding to this matter of marriage, can it be forgotten how many cases are now being chronicled, in the courts and in the press, of wives who are seeking separation or divorce from husbands who had only to land in home camps or foreign ports to prove unfaithful to their vows of constancy.

SECRETARY ALEXANDER, of the Department of Commerce, protesting against a proposed plan for merging with the Department of State many of the bureaus for foreign trade now under his jurisdiction, and also making known his inability to favor, as a matter of theory, closer relations of the diplomatic and consular arms of the State Department, goes on record unequivocally. "In my opinion," he says, "it is a grave mistake to join too closely diplomacy and commerce. It is both a bad thing for diplomacy and a bad thing for commerce." His basic reason for this opposition is that diplomacy, when made the secret servant of trade, degenerates; and, on the other hand, successful trade cannot wait on "the necessary dignity, secrecy, and careful circumspection of diplomacy." This criticism cuts both ways, but its origin makes it worth noting.

FAREWELL ADDRESS

By GEORGE WASHINGTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, SEPTEMBER 17, 1796¹

OBSERVE good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct. And can it be that good policy does not enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no distant period a great nation to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that in the course of time and things the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded, and that in place of them just and amicable feelings toward all should be culti-

vated. The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur.

Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation prompted by ill will and resentment sometimes impels to war the government contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject. At other times it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations has been the victim.

So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country without odium, sometimes even with popularity, gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak toward a great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter. Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp

¹ Richardson, James D.: "A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents," 1789-1897, vol. 1, pp. 221-223. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1896-1899.

the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enemies.

Our detached and distinct situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisition upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world, so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS

By THOMAS JEFFERSON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 4, 1801¹

ABOUT to enter, fellow-citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever State or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations,

¹Richardson: "Messages and Papers of the Presidents," vol. 1, pp. 323-324.

entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics, from which is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and arraignment of all abuses at the bar of the public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press, and freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus, and trial by juries impartially selected. These principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civic instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or of alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

SEVENTH ANNUAL MESSAGE

By JAMES MONROE, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, DECEMBER 5, 1823¹

AT THE proposal of the Russian Imperial Government, made through the minister of the Emperor residing here, a full power and instructions have been transmitted to the Minister of the United States at St. Petersburg, to arrange, by amicable negotiation, the respective rights and interests of the two nations on the northwest coast of this continent. A similar proposal had been made by His Imperial Majesty to the Government of Great Britain, which has likewise been acceded to. The Government of the United States has been desirous, by this friendly proceeding, of manifesting the great value which they have invariably attached to the friendship of the Emperor, and their solicitude to cultivate the best understanding with its government. In the discussions to which this interest has given rise and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and main-

¹Richardson: "Messages and Papers of the Presidents," vol. 2, pp. 200, 218, 219.

tain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellowmen on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to so do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced, that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are, of necessity, more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. And to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government *de facto* as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none. But in regard to those continents circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can any one believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition, in any form, with indifference.

They saw that to live by one man's will became the cause of all men's misery. This constrained them to come unto laws, wherein all men might see their duties beforehand and know the penalties of transgressing them.

RICHARD HOOKER,

Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, 1594.

AN AMERICAN IDEA OF A LEAGUE OF NATIONS

By JAMES L. TRYON, Ph. D., Cambridge, Mass.

WHAT is the American idea of a league of nations? Who can say? One can tell what *an* American idea of a league of nations is with more confidence than he can state what *the* American idea of it is. The attitude of the United States Senate has shown that no American, not even the President himself, can with certainty, beforehand and uninstructed, assure other nations what kind of league his entire country, or the political party of which he is the leader, will unqualifiedly accept. But of several plans of a league we may say, "This is or was *an* American idea." We may say it of the original platform of the League to Enforce Peace, because it had a large number of adherents in America. We may say it of the Covenant of the League of Nations, because, though it resembles the outline of a proposed league of the same name that was put forward by the British leader, General Smuts, it was based in part on the plan of the League to Enforce Peace and in part on proposals made by our President, notably, if we are rightly informed, the guarantee of territorial integrity and independence, and was urged by him upon Europe as one of the prime objectives of the war and one of the chief points to be realized in the settlement of peace. We may say it of the Covenant as amended by the Lodge reservations, because they Americanized the spirit of that document by safeguarding the interests of the United States. And we may say it particularly of at least one other important plan that is not so well known as these proposals, but that cannot fail to receive first consideration if the Covenant fails of acceptance and we begin the agitation for world reconstruction anew. This plan was offered by the American Institute of International Law in its *Recommendations of Habana Concerning International Organization*, January 23, 1917.

The plan of the American Institute of International Law may be called the historic plan of the world-peace movement for international reconstruction, because it represents a continuity of thought and development on this subject from the beginning. The proposal for better international organization is not new and we must not let it appear to be; it has a long and honorable history which is sometimes overlooked. The new element in it is not in its aim, which is peace with justice, but in new methods of accomplishing its aim. A plan for a congress and court of nations, arbitration, mediation, and the codification of international law, although in some of its aspects primarily European, was elaborated by William Ladd, founder of the American Peace Society, and presented to the crowned heads of Europe before most of our public men were born. Substantially this plan, based on past political experience in the life of nations, but adapted to the growing needs of the times, was in process of general acceptance through the action of the Hague conferences, with which it harmonized. But it has also corresponded with the foreign policy of the United States, from the days of Washington through a succession of Presidents and Secretaries of State. Secretary Root, in our own time, urged upon the Amer-

ican delegates to the second Hague conference this continuous development of the peace idea and, with the success of the Supreme Court of the United States in mind, outlined in principle what the conference drafted and conditionally adopted as the Court of Arbitral Justice. This tribunal, when instituted by further diplomatic action, was to be a judicial court of arbitration as distinguished from the present Hague court, which, however, was also to remain operative as the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague. The system adopted at the Hague was that of a diplomatic-judicial organization, whose crowning feature for our present day was first of all to be a court of international justice. This was always to be ready to try controversies between nations and render judgment on the basis of law; but no internationalized force was to be put at the disposal of the court for the enforcement of its decisions. The nations were supposed to accept these decisions in good faith, and, furthermore, to be moved to accept them both because of the justice which they proclaimed and because of the compelling influence of an enlightened international public opinion which was in process of education.

But with the outbreak of the World War, which the Hague system did not prevent, all thought of reconstruction on that basis was by many earnest and not a few impatient people thrown into the background and another system with new organs, especially an executive department, supported by international force, was proposed as an altogether better idea than that which was said to have failed. This new system, after having various titles in this country and Great Britain, was finally given the name of the league of nations and the Hague was forgotten as if it had never been. But why the Hague system should be so severely condemned, especially when a good part of it would have to be perpetuated in any reconstruction that, short of world federation, for which we are not ready, marked real progress toward peace with justice, it is difficult to understand; and why no mention was made of the Hague conferences, the court of the conventions, even of the convention relating to the regulation of war, the violation of which was an offense to mankind, has never been satisfactorily explained. The Hague system had been useful in preventing armed conflict and, as in the case of Russia and Japan, in ending war when once begun, but it did not pretend to put an end to all war; the very fact that treaties for the regulation of war and the observance of neutrality were made at the conferences showed that the statesmen who participated in them knew that the day of universal peace had not arrived, but that war might in some evil moment return, in which case its cruelties should be limited as much as possible and the rights and duties of neutrals fixed. Let us hope that after we have established the League of Nations, with Geneva as the world capital, and erected buildings at great expense, we shall not within a few years begin another reconstruction that will leave out the name both of the League and the capital as if they and the high ideas which we now associate with them had gone out of our minds altogether. This indeed would be a tragic experience, and let us not look for it; but it cannot help being suggested.

Some publicists and not a few statesmen have de-

clared that if an international force pledged to act in case of emergency could have been summoned, the attack of Austria on Serbia and the invasion of Belgium by Germany could not have happened. But such a force was not wanted or it might have been available. There was neither in 1899 nor in 1907, the dates of the Hague conferences, any more than in August, 1914, a willingness on the part of the family of nations to subscribe to a general agreement to provide for the use of an international army and navy, usually called, or miscalled, an international police. That idea was in the minds of several distinguished publicists who were receiving a hearing, but there was not sentiment enough for it among the governments to put it into the form of law. There were good reasons for this; for since the days of the Holy Alliance, of Metternich and his autocratic allies, international police had been discredited, especially by liberal-minded men. In those days it had been used by reactionary rulers to interfere in the domestic affairs of neighboring States to put down revolutionists who were seeking constitutional freedom and to prevent the growth of national spirit where men of the same race wanted to live under the same flag. The people of Italy and Spain were its victims; the nations of Latin America were, fortunately, saved by the Monroe Doctrine and other conditions from sharing the same fate as their European brothers. Meantime there had grown up a belief that international police permanently organized, whether available as national contingents or as a collective force, under international executive direction, would mean the loss of national independence and sovereignty, which in our day all States have prized; and no nation was willing to put itself in a position to be sacrificed. The idea of a general guarantee of territorial integrity and independence, except by single States for protectorates or weaker States, or by an alliance for temporary purposes, was, as a rule, thought to be impracticable, although there were special cases of permanently neutralized States, like Belgium and Switzerland, that lived under a guarantee of a limited number of nations. International conditions before the war were unfavorable for a general guarantee. A guarantee of the entire *status quo* as the foundation of a new world order was deemed unthinkable by men who realized how unsatisfactory was the map of the world, and especially of Europe, with Alsace-Lorraine in the hands of Germany, with the Balkan peoples dissatisfied, and with other races having dreams of nationality unrealized. And even now a general guarantee is believed by many students of this subject to be a matter about which the United States should be cautious in sharing unless it wishes to send its troops back to Europe to enforce it, although a limited temporary guarantee, such as an assurance to France that if unrighteously attacked, as in 1914, America would go to her rescue, is believed by some statesmen to be feasible.

While, however, the World War was under way and a belief was growing in this country, and in Great Britain especially, though to some extent in other countries, as shown by the organization of societies in France and Holland, that an international force would tend to prevent future wars and should be provided for in the reconstruction of a peace system after the great conflict was over, the American Institute of International Law,

in its *Recommendations of Habana Concerning International Organization*, proposed a plan that was founded upon the historic idea, the development of the Hague conferences, without the sanction of force. The American Institute of International Law is comprised of distinguished publicists, eminent lawyers, former ministers of state, and some judges of the Hague court, elected from the twenty-one republics of Pan America, including the United States. It is therefore a respectable body of authority whose views on international questions deserve consideration. It did not, however, offer its scheme as a finality or as a panacea, but with a certain degree of modesty and open-mindedness put it forth as a minimum basis for discussion of the problems of international reorganization.*

There are certain noteworthy characteristics about this plan and some omissions in it that deserve consideration. But we should remember that it is only a briefly stated basis for discussion; not a detailed draft or treaty. If it were a treaty, or were embodied in a series of treaties, like the treaty with Germany or the Hague conventions, it would be extensively developed. The plan proposes the continuance of the society of nations as an association of independent States upon an equal basis before the law. It does not recognize the primacy of the Great Powers as of right, nor does it name any dependant group of them as they emerge from the World War. The war was not ended when these suggestions were made; but, even if it had been, the theory underlying the plan is that of a reorganization of the whole family of nations on an equal footing. It precludes the leadership of any one State as of right, for example, the right of Russia, because she initiated the Hague conferences, to preside over them through the instrumentality of a Russian chairman, as was the case in 1899 and 1907, to the parliamentary advantage of Russia. The feature of the plan that provides for a judicial union not only admits regularly recognized independent nations to membership, but self-governing dominions that are attached to empires, as is the case with the Universal Postal Union, which is taken as a model. But as the court to be created is a legal rather than a political body, a court of judges and not a congress of delegates, and its rule is to be in accordance with law instead of being subject to expediency; and as the court is likely to be small and representative of the interests of the whole body of States organized in the union rather than of the interests of particular States, this apparent irregularity of membership may offer no insurmountable objection. The plan says nothing about the concentration of the scattered administrative unions at a single capital; but there seems to be no opposition to this idea in principle, provided such concentration is desired. The council of conciliation that would be set up might represent the extension to the family of nations of the principle of the Bryan treaties for the advancement of peace, several of which have been adopted between the United States and other countries, but modifications might have to be made to suit the world as a whole. The plan does not prohibit or renounce the use of force, but it emphasizes public opinion as a sanction. The court itself is not empowered to use force

against a disobedient State. Public opinion, naturally, would command the acceptance of a wise and just decision if hesitancy to obey were shown, and we know that it brings millions of armed men into the field once its sense of right is violated, for, as the World War has shown, nations will rally to the support of right whether there is or is not a previously organized international force already to be summoned to action. This plan says nothing about the Monroe Doctrine, but we should expect a reservation on this point as strong as that which is attached to the Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes. This plan says nothing about the limitation of armaments—a matter that the Hague conferences did not deal with except in the form of a study of the question and resolutions in favor of the idea of a limitation—but the idea may be taken up whenever the nations are ready to consider it. This plan does not insist upon the registration and publication of all kinds of treaties, nor does it authorize the conferences to consider harmful treaties; and by it no broad inquisitorial jurisdiction is given to the association of States or to any council created to act in case of war or threat of war. But these are matters for development when the nations are quite willing to have their affairs adjusted by an association that is clothed with political and executive as well as judicial power. This plan establishes no system of mandatory or trustee States for conquered colonies, backward States, or weak peoples that need guidance in the management of their affairs; but it does not preclude such arrangement at the proper time. But a more complete form of internationalization than the mandatory system provides, and one that is above suspicion of national advantage gained by territorial allotments made under the peace treaty, may eventually receive public approval. Guarantees of territorial integrity and independence are not found in this plan, but they would more properly come with conditions farther advanced toward world federation than we have actually reached. They belong to an age of general pacification, when nations, great and small, are satisfied with their place in the international system perhaps when they have adopted standardized forms of governments—*e. g.*, republics—if that time ever comes, and when the occasional law-breaker may be served notice that invasion of another State or the imposition of an imperial form of government is likely to meet with international resistance.

The plan of the American Institute of International Law looks forward to a world legislature, but for the present confines itself to a diplomatic conference. It would give power now to recommend and later perhaps to declare law; and it takes a step toward a world executive by proposing an executive committee that shall be charged with securing the ratification of conventions adopted by the conferences and with influencing unity of action among the governments. This committee might be made up at first of the diplomatic representatives of the nations at The Hague or at some other capital; for example, new duties could be conferred upon the Permanent Administrative Council of the present Hague court until a different executive body is established. In other words, the plan is in harmony with the idea of establishing the three usually accepted departments of government—legislative, executive, and judi-

* See inside cover (page 110).

cial—but at present is concerned with the practical question of establishing a system that is adapted to a society of independent States. It assumes, like the Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, that these States recognize the principle of solidarity, and that they have respect for law, and that they desire to co-operate, but prefer to remain free. And this is also the historic American peace idea.

The Plan of the Covenant of the League of Nations

The plan of the American Institute of International Law, the historic American plan for reconstruction, was not, however, adopted by the Peace Conference at Paris, although necessarily some of the principles contained in the new plan are inherited from the past. The Covenant of the League of Nations was based upon the scheme devised and interpreted by General Smuts, who represented Great Britain, but contained new matter which had the approval of some eminent publicists in this country and elsewhere, as, for example, Article 10, as well as additions, that have been attributed to the President. Some details must also have been suggested by various members of the drafting committee, although we are not told by what members.

As first proposed, this plan was both warmly praised and severely criticised here. It was then amended and submitted to the United States Senate for advice and consent to ratification. Various reservations, some of them practically in the nature of amendments, were proposed, the most notable of which were associated with the name of Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and are identified with his policy. These reservations were not accepted, and it was impossible to secure a two-thirds majority, as required by our Constitution, to get the consent of the Senate to ratification, either with or without them.

The Lodge reservations help to protect the sovereignty and independence of the United States, but hardly do more than that. They expressly make the action of Congress necessary to participation in war by this country in response to a call from the League, so far as possible prevent Europe, through the League, from interfering with the Monroe Doctrine, or even from interpreting it without our consent, the Covenant possibly being against our exclusive customary claim in this matter; they except from consideration by the League, its organs or other Powers, purely American domestic questions, some of which are specified; make necessary some legislation by Congress with regard to the appointment and authorization of commissions, including in some cases confirmation by the Senate; and require the consent of Congress for certain expenditures that might be involved in our participation in the work of the League, while in case of war or invasion of the United States allow us to increase our armaments at discretion. The reservations restrict the effect on the United States of the extra voting power of Great Britain and her self-governing dominions when either the Empire or the colonies participate in an election or decision of a question upon which votes are taken; and lay down a necessary prerequisite that at least three of the Great Powers that won the war shall accept these conditions. There are also other reservations, one of the most important

of which is the clause relating to the reversion of the rights of Germany in Shantung. These, it is generally admitted, should go back to China, the original owner, instead of to Japan, the conquering possessor, the claims of which nation might have to be defended later by the League and therefore by the United States, if now approved.

But even with the Lodge reservations the general organs of the League and its powers as regards the rest of the world are practically unaffected; its authority to act, and even to intervene in case of war or threat of war anywhere in the world outside the United States, and possibly even here, is practically intact; the enforcement features, the guarantees of territorial integrity and independence, upholding the present *status quo* as the future world order; the system of mandatory or trustee States for weak, backward peoples, or conquered colonies, and the authority to examine and revise treaties, as well as to deal with international situations generally, without, however, restrictions such as might be provided by a declaration of the rights of nations and of individuals; these are all still in the Covenant of the League of Nations. An examination of the Covenant shows that as qualified by the Lodge reservations it has not been destroyed, as many people have thought, but has simply been Americanized, and even now is far in advance of the basis proposed by the American Institute of International Law, and therefore of the historic American program for the discussion of world reconstruction.

Under these circumstances it is a question whether from the point of view of those who prefer the Covenant to the historic American plan, or to any other plan, there has not been a first-class mistake made in opposing the Lodge resolutions and one that it may take years to correct, for sentiment for the naked Covenant itself seems to be waning in this country every day. Doubtless refusal to accept the Lodge reservations was due in part to a fear that if the United States were permitted to put them on the Covenant other nations might ask for reservations of their own until by process of amendment the constitution of the League would be so weakened that it would amount to nothing; but if other countries desire to make reservations the implication must be that not only America, but the rest of the world is being asked to do something reluctantly, and that therefore there is a danger that pledges are being made that will not be kept, which is the very point that, so far as this country is concerned, we should be on our guard against; for we must take no obligation that we do not intend to keep. If we do take upon ourselves obligations and do not keep them, we lay ourselves liable under the terms of the League, as Covenant-breakers, to be invaded or ostracized and possibly ruined by the organized nations of the world.

What May Be Done if the League Covenant Is Not Ratified

If the treaty with Germany, embodying the Covenant, and qualified, so far as the United States is concerned, by the Lodge reservations or their substantial equivalent, is ratified—that is, if we adopt the Covenant in the only form that now seems possible—we shall expect to give the League a fair trial. Such further proposals as are made for international reconstruction may be ex-

pected to take the form of amendments later, for which the Covenant fortunately provides, rather than popular agitation for a new constitution, unless perchance we should have another great war followed by another reconstruction. But nobody can expect an international any more than a national constitution to remain unaltered. A movement especially in the direction of a declaration of rights of nations and of individuals or races, such as may now be found in substance in some of the special treaties made between the Allied and Associated Powers and other nations, but not appearing in the Covenant as applicable to all nations; a discussion of the redistribution of territory, colonial and other kinds, together with claims of some nationalities for nationhood or local independence in a federation and efforts to take the control of the League from a few select Powers in order to make it more strictly democratic and equitable may be expected.

But if the Covenant is lost the movement for world peace will not stop; for it is too great a movement to die as the result of such failure. It is bound to go on and in the end will become more unified than ever before. It will be revived with vigor in due season and new plans for reconstruction, probably of a more moderate character, will be proposed. In case we have to make a new start the plan of the American Institute of International Law, the plan that has historical continuity, which offers many points of agreement and few for controversy, either in this country or among the nations of the world, but from which we have departed in choosing the Covenant, though that document itself reproduces some historic ideas, should be brought to the attention of the governments.

If a new constitution were proposed, it may be assumed that it would not be formulated immediately, but possibly within two or three years, or after the world situation has settled down. In that case it would be easier than it is now to follow the Hague rule and admit all nations to membership at the outset. Such an arrangement might be objectionable to the Powers that are now in control; but if we could agree upon a readjustment, there might be this compensating advantage, in the long run, that the international governments we should set up would be based upon the willing consent of all the nations that subscribed to it, and might be expected in time of crisis to receive loyal support, such as might not be forthcoming under a constitution made by some Powers and at first controlled by them, but excluding others or admitting them in principle, but not in fact, or leaving them for a time as probationers. Whether such new constitution would include the mandatory system, the territorial guarantees of Article 10, which are closely connected with it, a system of enforcement by boycott and the military arm, and an international council in which the Great Powers preponderate as of right; and whether it would confer a world-wide jurisdiction over matters of peace and war, and provide for the revision of treaties may be doubtful, unless the world is ready as a whole to form a political as distinguished from a judicial union, which was what we appeared to be on the point of organizing when the problem of reconstruction was interrupted by the war; but the principles of conciliation, investigation, arbitration, administrative unions, whether separate or con-

trated at a capital, and the idea of a better organization of the family of nations, together with a wide-spread determination to insist upon respect for law and the rights of nationalities are here to stay.

And what more can we say? Of course, we may be criticized by Europe for hesitating to adopt or for actually rejecting what appeared to be our own idea, a league of nations to secure peace; but it must be remembered that the form which this idea was given in the proposed international constitution of the League of Nations was not the idea of all the American people, and went far beyond our traditional relationship with the rest of the world, much farther than we are all prepared to go at this particular time, but perhaps no farther than we shall be ready to go at a later time. We must not disparage the Covenant as a political achievement from the point of view of securing agreement to a proposed constitution. But the peace question is not one that the machinery of constitutions alone can solve. Conditions as well as constitutions are necessary to world peace. It is a practical question in the solution of which certain international factors have to be carefully considered. The character of nations must be accurately understood. Their policies, motives, standards, and interests must be assessed in the light of history, clearly comprehended and calmly judged.

Have the ethical standards of all the nations been absolutely purified and changed by the war? Is the spirit of empire dead, or has it survived to show itself again in new though less objectionable forms than those of old? And if the thirst for empire still exists, is permanent peace with justice possible? Here is an important consideration. When nations are satisfied with their territory, markets, and commercial privileges; when nationalities that desire unity and justice have been given their rights; when races that seek their freedom feel that they have it, we shall be farther along the road to peace than we are today and in a better position to adopt a constitution of world union based on force. But while there are national spheres of influence in foreign territory, an irredenta to be regained and subjugated peoples to be freed, while rights are withheld against the consent of nations that claim them, can we expect stability, even though we try to fix it in a constitution? And can the United States, without carefully safeguarding its life and its interests, by at least a recognition of the limitations of our own Constitution in regard to participation in war, undertake to guarantee the international *status quo*?

But it will be asked by earnest men who will be greatly disappointed if the United States should refuse to ratify the Covenant, "Shall we remain in isolation and shrink from our duty to help the world?" We cannot remain in isolation. We know that we do not expect to become isolated. We could not separate ourselves from the rest of the world if we would. We shall do our duty in any case. And let no nation think that because we appear to hesitate over the Covenant we shall refrain from cooperation in the interest of our country and the welfare of the world if the same or a similar set of circumstances, such as the unjustified invasion of Belgium or France, should occur. But we want to reserve the right to attend to our own affairs. We are willing to concede the same privilege to other nations. We want

to keep out of the antagonisms of Europe and we want Europe to keep out of our affairs. There has been no substantial change among our people as a whole in regard to those fundamental principles of policy that we received from our fathers and that have proved to make for our peace. If Europe needs us we stand ready to help her, but we prefer to remain free. We are willing to co-operate, but unwilling to be controlled. And we are unlikely for the present to join any union that compromises the independence of the United States or obligates this country to share the control of the world.

THE WAR HAS NOT DESTROYED

VII

The Human Struggle for a Moral Ideal

By ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

COMMON CONCEPTIONS OF THE MORAL IDEAL

IF ONE were to summarize writings dealing with the moral elements of personal success, such a summary, I think, would be seen to consist substantially of four qualities, namely, worship, love, labor, and a creative self-sacrifice. And one must confess that this is an inclusive category.

Reverence

True, we must accept worship as an aspect of any moral ideal, for religion and morality do not differ in kind. If we were to put the matter into the form of mathematics, we might say that morality is to religion as the seed is to the fruit. This is why reverence occupies a place so important in the writings of the moralists. There is a veneration touched with fear when we stand in the presence of beauty, goodness, truth; or when we think upon the Unknown. This is reverence. We shall grant that there is a difference between the forms or rituals and the blood or sinews of real reverence. Not that the forms and rituals are in and of themselves evil; but that in poetry, music, art, behavior, the forms and rituals are but the means to higher ends; that, as Gladstone once put it, "Nothing can make ritual safe except the strict observance of its purpose, namely, that it shall supply wings to the human soul in its callow efforts at upward flight." There is in us a substance of things hoped for; a high human feeling, reaching, for the want of a better phrase, toward the stars; a realization of a weakness supported by an unflinching strength; a companionship with the poets as "from the naked top of some bold headland" they behold "the sun rise up and bathe the world in light"; an unwordable poem in us when, alone by the sea, or beneath the night sky, or when beholding the wood rose, we love it and leave it on its stalk. This is reverence, the forerunner of worship. The systematization of it has given rise to the religions. When seen in others, it is a beautiful thing; for he who feels it, who is it, unconsciously radiates it. It is the secret of great teachers. The Gamaliels in education all had it. It is an essential fact in the rise of successful States. As Senator Hoar said in his oration on Robert Burns:

"No race or nation will ever be great, or will long maintain greatness, unless it holds fast to the faith in a living God, in a beneficent Providence, and in a personal immortality. To man as to nation, every gift of noblest origin is breathed upon by this hope's perpetual breath. I am not here to make an argument. I only affirm a fact. Where this faith lives are found courage, manhood, power. When this faith dies, courage, manhood, power die with it."

Love

Any moral ideal must include also a systematic growth of those affections which beget kindness in thought and deed. In all the arts much is made of love, of its endurance, forgiveness, trust; of its waiting, suffering, questioning, silence; of its freshness as of the dawn, the sacred perfume of it, its infinity. This great thing of the heart, often winged with fire, is the theme of poetry, of music, and of all the graphic expression of genius. It is the majestic miracle of life. At its best it is the little Eppie entering from out the night to melt the Silas Marner within us. If there be a Savior of the world it is love. It makes homes, schools, and all the personal relations tolerable. It is the one mark of genuine superiority. It is the hope of overcoming competition and conflict with co-operation and justice. It is the only quality in us which gives and which gets in the giving. It takes the "common man" and raises him above the contempt shown in the ancient arts, in the poems of Dante and Shakespeare, and gives to him the place faintly dreamed of by the revolutionists through the long past of aspiring revolutions.

Labor

And labor? Of course, labor. Life depends upon production, transportation, care of the young. These things demand labor. Then, too, there is in all healthy individuals an instinct for a personal perfection, a moral self-development calling for cleanliness in body and behavior, for strength and kindness, all of which demand application and industry. This is true not only of the principal things, but of the petty details, the unseen behaviors which bring neither praise nor recognition. This instinct says to us that we must rise above envies, jealousies, foolish prides, shams, gloatings over the misfortunes of others, even of our enemies. This perfection, demanding much labor, is seen to be good will; not a silly thing, but that good will which is sane enough to make a stern decision, if need be; a good will which can look to the welfare of others with self-forgetting generosity; a good will that finds greatness in little things:

"I have owed to them,
In hours of weariness, sensations sweet,
Felt in the blood, and felt along the heart,
. . . feelings, too,
Of unremembered pleasure such, perhaps,
As have no slight or trivial influence
On that best portion of a good man's life,
His little, nameless, unremembered acts
Of kindness and of love."

If we are to attain unto that perfection which understands the other fellow, which bases judgments upon facts seen in their right relations; if we are to overcome

irritation, snappishness, insolence, heedlessness; if we are to attain unto those courtesies which make homes and societies agreeable and safe; if we are to attain unto that excellence in the hidden portions as did Phidias with the unseen parts of the statuary in the pediments of the Parthenon, we must labor. To labor for perfection is seen to be an element of the moral ideal, because it is the beginning of progress and of the conservation of life. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect," is a cry out of the very heart of humanity.

A will honorably to achieve something worth while is an essential element of the moral ideal. Hence men are seen to turn toward a morally scientific frame of mind—an open, honest judicial attitude toward life, abhorring quackery. Men find consolation in their devotions to moral ideals, positive and ardent. As Plutarch said, excusing the time and pains spent on writing his lives of illustrious men: "Virtue, by the bare statement of its aims, can so affect men's minds as to create at the same time admiration of the things done and desire to imitate the doers of them." In this will to achieve, hero-worship plays its part. Out of hero-worship springs principles which are more than pious professions, a manliness which is "neither a dream nor an outgrown fashion of an earlier age." The great Arnold of Rugby set before his boys two supreme ideals—moral thoughtfulness and devotion to duty. The strength of Greek and Roman grew out of the recitals to youth of the heroic deeds of the fathers. It is the abstract in characters of history and literature that men adore and emulate. Inspired by them, men go forth to labor and achieve.

Creative Unselfishness

This important element of labor often becomes a strenuous business. Virtue is a virile thing. Most of our fears are pitiful. To pay one's debts, to support one's own, and to keep out of jail require a measure of hardness, a certain kind of strenuous "sand," that can get results and thwart shysters. Titian's picture of the "Christ and Judas" excels them all in this; through the love and holiness of that face is a certain worldly wisdom which says, "I know you Judas." Shaw does us a service by calling attention to the fact that a "gentle Jesus meek and mild" is a "sniveling modern invention." Surely Jesus must have been fascinating, robust, and buoyant. To be a saint does not imply that one must be a ninny or a weakling. It is often necessary to stand up under the fire of criticism, for example, whether that criticism be just or unjust. The best answer to criticism, like the best answer to praise, is hard work, attention to business. If men are not responsible for their feelings, appetites, passions, they are responsible for their slacks in will. Sloth and dishonesty are as cowardice in the captain who abandons his passengers aboard a sinking ship.

Thus the moral ideal must include a creative self-sacrifice, which means from of old, to make sacred. Duty is a natural law the observance of which is mandatory; but, if creative, it is or should be pleasant. There is no morality in the performance of duty through fear, on the one hand, or through priggishness, on the other. The performance of duty is never weakness; but,

furthermore, it is never a choice of evils. Duty can never be a real self-denial, however much it may be relatively so. Arguing from the law of evolution, Spencer once wrote:

"Pleasure being producible by the exercise of any structure which is adjusted to its special end, he will see the necessary implication to be that, supposing it consistent with the maintenance of life, there is no kindly activity which will not become a source of pleasure if continued; and that therefore pleasure will eventually accompany every mode."

Therefore creative sacrifice, goodness, is not real self-denial. The Christian religion would have more followers if it were not pictured as so thorny, meek, and unhappy. A practical goodness, a goodness that harmonizes flesh and spirit, that unites the Greek and Christian in us, that flows, ever fresh and beautiful, "forth from the eternal heart," the creative self-sacrificing life is not the self-denying life. It is, indeed, the only life of any real getting.

"And thus looking within and around me, I ever renew
(With that stoop of the soul which in bending upraises it too)

The submission of man's nothing perfect to God's all complete,

As by each new obelance in spirit I climb to his feet."

THE AGE-LONG STRUGGLE

Thus worship, love, labor, and creative self-sacrifice are agreed to be elements in the moral ideal. To study these things reveals the fact that the most interesting problem for man is himself. The history of them is fascinating, because it shows man in his high quest for life—a quest which has given to us the ancient Faust Saga, the war of the Titans and giants, the revolt of Prometheus, the social endeavors, politics, arts, schools, religions. If men are doomed to failure in their attempts to pierce the gloom, it is human to protest, to struggle against the limitations, to strive to see. The inmost sentiment of the human heart has always been a question. With Goethe, we must all ask, "How may I learn what holds the earth together 'in its inmost core'?" Once we begin these inquiries, there is no end. How may I cease rummaging in empty words? What in life is really worth while? Is there a goal? Is there an open road? What means my life? To say that we must worship, love, labor, and create through self-sacrifice, therefore, is not all. Why are they necessary? These things must be explained, men say. And so men have tried to explain. And there have been many explanations. Since, to use Eucken's fine phrase, "the past, rightly understood, is no mere past," let us recall something of the three great human interpretations of the moral ideal.

Pleasure

The first attempt to phrase the moral aim is known as the pleasure ideal. It has had many interpreters and many interpretations; but the conclusion of them all has been that we are on this world to get pleasure. Even if we measure our actions by prudence, foresight, and calculation, the prudence, foresight, and calculation are that we may attain unto pleasure. Since the earliest

dawn of serious writing, there have been men content to eliminate any necessity even for calculation—men convinced that the sensation of the moment is life's only ultimate reality. Believing this, the moral ideal for them has meant simply a surrender to the present. Since we only live from moment to moment, let us live the moment and be happy in it, at all hazards. Away with pain and despair. Away with any prudential concern over the ideal welfare. Away with tears of tomorrow which may never come. Away with all the fretful problems. Let us welcome each dying hour as a sweet end in itself. Let us welcome today and now. True dignity is found only in the sentient life; in a disregard for the future; in a perfect preoccupation of the moment. To live is to feel. Life is measured only by the intensity of its passions.

This doctrine is not peculiar alone to Horace, Omar, Ecclesiastes. It pictures the child mind everywhere. Indeed, it seems to be a device of Nature for keeping children healthy and strong. But, beneficial as it is for the child, satiety, if not reason, reveals its limitations. For the rational adult the realization that he is a thinking being has led him to modify this pure pleasure conception of the moral ideal. Even if pleasure is the moral ideal, it is not the pleasure of the moment, but the total pleasure of a complete life that marks the purpose behind the "weary weight of all this unintelligible world."

Play, unrestrained delight, comfort, peace—these are the attributes of the moral ideal taught by Epicurus and his followers. But this ancient interpretation of the moral ideal—not extinct, let it be said—was easily seen to over-emphasize the self to the exclusion of the common good. Pleasure was thought of primarily in terms of quantity, little attention being given to its quality. Upon analysis, especially upon trial, the meaning of pleasure itself was seen to be vague; and, as was inevitable, the whole tendency of its followers was toward an inescapable doubt and pessimism.

In later times, therefore, there have been many attempts to patch up the pleasure interpretation of the moral ideal. It is still widely believed possible to make it suffice as a workable expression of a livable moral ideal. These newer interpretations have pointed to Christianity, especially to the evolutionary doctrines of science, assuring us that here are grounds for optimism. When we are told that the moral ideal is pleasure, we are informed that pleasure means the greatest pleasure of the greatest number; not personal pleasure, but general pleasure. Thus there is a higher kind of pleasure, pleasure graded on the basis of quality, not of quantity. But the inevitable corollary of views even such as these show that all our activities, even our altruistic ones, spring from selfish considerations, from utilitarian motives only.

And yet there must have been unselfishness before it could have been discovered that there is any pleasure or utility in being unselfish. It is not true that our altruisms always make for our good. There are heroisms devoid of self-calculating motives. The moral is not always useful. Virtue is primarily a matter of motives. There is a vicariousness in what Wundt calls the "social will" that pleasure does not account for. So the pleasure ideal has never held an undisputed sway.

Intellect

Of course, it must be granted that we are creatures of varying sensibilities; but there are aspects of the moral ideal outside of pleasures. This, too, has been realized from of old. The worthiest things of life were found by Aristotle and Plato to consist not of the life of sentient pleasures so much as of the life of what they chose to call "pure reason." Hence, alongside the search of "pleasure for pleasure's sake," there arose the demand, "duty for duty's sake." The extreme expression of this later view has been founded in the belief that the moral ideal is not of the sensibilities at all; but, rather, that it is in a purely rational life, a life of insight and self-knowledge. Knowledge is virtue; virtue is knowledge. That was the fundamental teaching of Socrates. Thus the moral ideal and the life of "right reason" have been believed to be one and the same thing. The Cynics looked upon pleasure, when sought for its own sake, as an evil. Hence there developed, among a large school of thinkers, an ostentatious contempt for pleasure. The far more influential Stoics did not, however, accept this extreme view. They believed in conformity to custom; in a universal spiritual kingdom; in the principle that men should live according to Nature. And this Nature they conceived to be a living soul, the highest expression of which is man and the gods. Repose of mind, self-control, rather than living happily or even living at all, became their goal. Wisdom under universal law; virtue, conscience, which was felt to be the measure of all right action; charity conceived of as a duty; perfect freedom, which knows neither grief nor anxiety; serenity, poise, right-mindedness, obedience to the laws of Nature—these constitute the Stoic's conception of the moral ideal. Thus taught Aurelius, Seneca, Epictetus. As Epictetus wrote:

"Everything has two handles, one by which it may be borne, another by which it cannot. If your brother acts unjustly, do not lay hold of the affair by the handle of his injustice, for by that it cannot be borne; but rather by the opposite—that he is your brother; that he was brought up with you; and thus you will lay hold on it as it is to be borne."

This intellectual interpretation of the moral ideal gave rise also to the Ascetics, who abandoned as far as possible all sentient life for the hermit's cell, dens in the desert, starvation, vigilance, and, like Simeon Stylites, for indescribable physical tortures. As Edwin Arnold makes to say the fair Buddha, sitting under his tree watching through the night:

"man

With senses naked to the sensible,
A helpless mirror of all shows which pass
Across his heart; and so Vedanā grows—
'Sense-life'—false in its gladness, fell in sadness,
But sad or glad, the Mother of Desire,
Trishna, that thirst which makes the living drink
Deeper and deeper of the false salt waves
Whereon they float, pleasures, ambitions, wealth
Praise, fame, or domination, conquest, love;
Rich meats and robes, and fair abodes, and pride
Of ancient lines, and lust of days, and strife
To live, and sins that flow from strife, some sweet.

Some bitter. Thus Life's thirst quenches itself
With draughts which double thirst, but who is wise
Tears from his soul this Trishna . . .

And so constraining passions that they die
Famished . . .
Untill—greater than Kings, than Gods more glad!—
The aching craze to live ends, and life glides—
Lifeless—to nameless quiet, nameless joy,
Blessed Nirvana—sinless, stirless rest—
That change which never changes!"

In Nietzsche's "Thus Spake Zarathustra"—a book which has been compared with Pilgrim's Progress and with Piers Ploughman—this purely rational interpretation of the moral ideal also appears. Zarathustra is represented to us as living apart with an eagle, always symbolic of pride, and with a serpent, always symbolic of wisdom, the ideal type of the man that is to be—man with no relation to humanity save a rather loose regard for his disciples. It is this impersonation of authority who condemns with startling invective the pleasure ideal—indeed, everything modern—as altogether bad. It is from this incarnation of the man yet to be, this "Übermensch," Beyond-man, that Nietzsche learns a new rationalism, a rationalism which finds the moral ideal in the worship of this very Beyond-man, this Zarathustra, stalwart and beautiful—man with all the Titan graces of the ancient Greek, of Odin, of Napoleon; this man that is yet to be. Nietzsche's idea of freedom means to him—

"The will to be responsible for one's self; to keep the distance which separates one from another; to become more indifferent to hardship, severity, privation, and even to life; to be ready to sacrifice men for one's cause, one's self not excepted. . . . The man who has become free, how much more the spirit which has become free, treads under foot the contemptible species of well being dreamt of by shopkeepers, Christians, cows, women, Englishmen, and all other democrats. The free man is a warrior."

For Nietzsche man is a bridge, not a goal; a means to a nobler race yet to be.

"I teach you the Beyond-man. Man is something to be surpassed. What have you done to surpass him? All things hitherto have created something beyond themselves; and are ye going to be the ebb of this great tide, and rather revert to the animal than surpass man? What with the man is the ape? A joke and a sore shame. Man shall be the same for Beyond-man, a joke and a sore shame."

Nietzsche believes further that the weak must perish, and that they should be helped to do so; that, indeed, sympathy for the weak is a crime; that Christianity is the "most subterranean conspiracy that ever has existed—against healthiness, beauty, well-constitutedness, courage, intellect, benevolence of soul, against life itself."

Tolstoi, attempting to be genuinely Christian, taught a similar doctrine, though in a manner quite different. Soldier, adventurer in youth, artist, virile soul, admired genius, restless over the seeming rational and sentient dualism of this life, he finally despaired over it all and saw in his life nothing but the indulgence of his pas-

sions, a thing wholly without meaning. He saw himself a parasite, living upon the toil, blood, and sweat of a multitude seemingly happier than he. Forsaking the glamour of court life, studying the philosophy of Schopenhauer, he grew to feel that he must live the truth as he saw the truth, and that he must renounce all self-glorification for that heavy labor which only brings unrepining content. Marrying himself consistently to toil, poverty, non-resistance to evil, and to a universal sympathy and love, he strove to live a life of rational consistency, perfectly willing to go forward and quite prepared to die, believing that only that love is true love which knows no limit to sacrifice, even unto death.

Both Nietzsche and Tolstoi saw in the tendency of the times nothing but hopeless chaos. While Tolstoi taught a gospel of love, sympathy, and self-negation, Nietzsche, with pride and contempt, stood for a perfect self-assertion. But since they both disclaimed the claims of the sentient life, they were the antithesis and the complement of each other. If Nietzsche was a Stoic, Tolstoi was an Ascetic. Both were sternly arrayed against the pleasure interpretation of the moral ideal.

To list the opponents of the pleasure ideal is impossible. Of Kant, with his faith in *a priori* knowledge; with his search for reality in the realm of thought only; with his world depending upon pure reason merely; with his trinity of good will, freedom, and practical reason, there have been many followers. These followers have given to us many intuitive and speculative theories. Emphasizing duty, which they have failed to define; professing high heavenly conversations which few can understand, they have led us into a mystic maze where sacred and secular, finite and infinite, body and spirit, seem inextricably mixed.

It must be granted, however, that Kant's influence is at the foundation of that intellectual freedom which now nearly a century ago spread to America, a freedom which reached a high level in our Emerson:

"The foregoing generations beheld God and nature face to face; we through their eyes. Why should we not also enjoy an original relation to the universe? Why should we not have a poetry and philosophy of insight and not of tradition, and a religion by revelation to us, and not the history of theirs?"

But neither pleasure nor pure reason has answered the questions put by man in his search for his moral ideal. The tendency of the pleasure interpretation of the moral ideal is to over-emphasize realism, materialism, sensibility, the flesh; while the rationalists, frequently called, and strangely enough, the "naturalists," tend to dwell overmuch on reasons, idealisms, supernaturalisms, spiritisms, and utopias. The former consist for the most part of unrelated particulars without much system; the latter of an elaborate system without many particulars to systematize. To borrow two words from the older psychologists, the former is perceptual and the latter conceptual.

For these reasons it is argued that neither can be the final interpretation of the moral ideal. Since each leaves the other out and since there is truth in each, each is in error. The seeming dualism between them is only in the seeming. Stoic and Bacchus dwell in most of us. If some seem to be spontaneous, passionate, im-

pulsive, cavalier, luxurious, warm-blooded, realistic; and others cold, prudential, intellectual, puritanic, idealistic, it simply means that some men seem to belong more to one class than the other. Indeed, most of us can belong to one of these groups on Saturday and to the other on Sunday.

True Happiness

So it is argued that both the pleasure and the intellectual interpretation of the moral ideal break down. There must, therefore, be a third and a better interpretation. If we grant that there are facts to support the theory that the moral ideal must consist in the gratification of self, on the one hand, and that there are facts to support the theory that the moral ideal must take the direction indicated by the intellect only, on the other, then it must be agreed that each set of facts is inadequate for a satisfying interpretation of the total self, of a unified life, of a rational sentiency which is more than a life either of mere feeling or mere reason. Surely there must be a self-realization which includes both the sentient and the rational; hence, therefore, the total life. Flesh cannot ignore reason; neither can reason reject the demands of the flesh. Reason must recognize the existence of flesh and make the best of its rationalism. The practical job seems to be to create a life neither bestial, on the one hand, nor ascetic, on the other, but perfectly rounded and human. If the pursuit of pleasure tends to become ignoble, the evil is primarily in excess and abuse of what probably is divine. As Nietzsche says of the appetites:

"To annihilate passion and desires merely in order to obviate their folly and its unpleasant results appears to us at present to be simply an acute form of folly. We no longer admire the dentist who pulls out teeth that they may not ache. . . . To attack passions at the root means to attack life itself at the root."

Thus, through some spiritualization of desire, men struggle to find a higher interpretation of the moral ideal than is conceived of by those who pursue pleasure only, or by those who seek their goal merely by the methods of reason.

There must be a more permanent and universal moral ideal than either of these—an ideal which, including both of them, can create a life of body and spirit, as, say, did Browning with his harmony of the rational and sentient self, dynamically conceived. It is there where lies the larger interpretation of man's moral ideal. Perhaps the best word to express this synthetic ideal is happiness, by which is meant more than the sum of our pleasures, more than the findings of logic. As some one has said:

"Not in a life dominated solely by the feeling of sympathy, which rejects all pleasurable activity and offers to others what it refuses to itself; still less in a life of cold and loveless egotism and scornful pride; not in self-assertion alone nor in self-negation is the truly moral life. The true good of man—the principle and goal of ethics, transcending the antithesis of altruism and egoism—is a common good, realized in a society so organized as to give effect to the equal rights of all its members which belong to them in virtue of their common humanity, while affording oppor-

tunities for the development of the faculties with which men are so unequally endowed and giving scope for their exercise in the service of the whole."

This is nearer the lesson of happiness. It is the lesson missed by Tito Melema, but learned through much misery by the unhappy Faust. It is the theme of Tannhauser, and the conclusion of old age as it reckons up its gains and losses in "Rabbi Ben Ezra."

The moral ideal arises from no mere innate desire of grasping it. It is not a goal. It is an acquisition. If this ideal comes to us neither from the body nor from the mind, but from a synthesis of the two, then duty, whatever that may mean, the duty to see clearly, to feel truly, to create beautifully, can be apprehended only by a morally scientific and enthusiastic devotion to the problem of duty itself. Happiness includes the supreme duty to study duty. The moral ideal becomes thus, in a measure, the pursuit of duty, the performance of all duties, including the duty to study duty. This is why the moral ideal is not so much a bequest as a conquest; not so much a limited thing as a dynamic proportion. And the pursuit of it is the goal itself.

"Not of the sunlight,
Not of the moonlight,
Not of the starlight!
O young mariner,
Down to the haven
Call your companions,
Launch your vessel,
And crowd your canvas,
And, ere it vanishes
Over the margin,
After it, follow it,
Follow the Gleam!"

If, as Bergson says, "deduction succeeds in things moral only metaphorically," yet there is nothing to be gained by being skeptical of attaining unto this dynamically proportioned and ever-evolving moral ideal. If with Spencer, Comte, and the other skeptics we agree that we can know nothing of ultimate reality, yet we may believe that there are persons evolving through the stock experiences of the race. If this be so, then we may believe in a gradual unfolding of a genuine, human, and attainable moral ideal. Where men avoid fanaticisms and false statements they may trust themselves in their attempts to reach, outside the domains of pleasure on the one hand or of pure reason on the other, unto this moral ideal. "Humanism" was the name employed by Schiller to express what I have called this third interpretation of the moral ideal. Dewey has variously named it "instrumentalism" and "experimentalism," by which he evidently means a philosophy of the open mind. This "open-mind" interpretation, when systematized and raised to a philosophy, is what we now know as pragmatism. This pragmatism is predicated upon what seems to be a fact, namely, that anticipation is of more moral significance than recollection. The past is worthy if not only then primarily as an "instrument" for the successful attaining of the future. If we do not agree with the pragmatists, that the past is wholly dead, yet we may agree that reality for the most part lies before us. Intelligence, if it be intelligence, is "creative." But it is

equally true that if body and mind are to attain unto that synthetic ideal suggested by Tennyson's "Gleam," the task seems to be to find the course which will do for us two things, namely, enable us to realize the creative aspirations of our yesterdays, and strengthen us to make out of the opportunities of today and of tomorrow a worthy and a total life. To do this it is not necessary to settle the unsettled. We may let the philosophers bury their dead. If we are shut out from knowing the meaning of man in his relation to his world; if we cannot understand the relations between mind and matter; between appearance and reality; between consciousness and the objects of consciousness; between the eternal and the temporal, we may, however, guide our course with a full realization that the moral ideal must mean that man is more than a consumer of pleasures; that he is more than a thinker of thoughts; that he is a creator of life.

THE WAR HAS NOT DESTROYED

The war has not destroyed the attempts of men to reach unto such a moral ideal. Notwithstanding our compulsory school-attendance laws, which compel all our children between six and fifteen now to attend school, there is less bullying, less crookedness, and less vulgarity among our school boys and girls than in the days of the old red school-house, with its students primarily of a single race and with its voluntary attendance. The demand for a better character-training is the one thing upon which practically all educational leaders agree. Immoralities, personal or public, have never been more universally condemned than today. Constructive work in behalf of a prophylactic social hygiene has never been more hopeful. Our departments of charity, of corrections, of mental hygiene, and of related activities have never received so much thoughtful attention from the State as now. Our social institutions are less and less under the influence of petty politics and more and more under scientific direction and control. The consolidation and co-ordination of welfare agencies are becoming more and more hopefully a fact. Not only our churches and schools, but the army itself is emphasizing as never before in history the importance of cleanliness in body and habits; of strength, industry, obedience; of fairness to self and to the State; of bravery, modesty, truthfulness, and achievement.

These things are not of theoretical concern merely; they are matters of practical interest and accomplishment. Such questions as minimum standards for child welfare in employment; standards affecting the age, educational attainments, physical condition, and hours of employment—these are studied and reported upon by a children's bureau of the United States Department of Labor, with the effect that legislatures act more intelligently. Because of this an advance is made. State interest in minimum standards for the health of mothers and children is also a concrete and hopeful fact.

The will to reduce infant mortality; the sanitation of public buildings; the public recreational facilities; public clinics; legal protection from the evils of uncontrolled vice and exploitation—these are all direct evidences of a very present moral ideal. The very phrases "adequate income," "State supervision," "juvenile courts," indicate the practical content of that moral

ideal. When we are told of the necessity for an adequate wage for the father; for wholesome and pleasant housing and living conditions; for the abolition of racial discrimination; for the control of commercialized amusements; for the requirement that child-welfare measures in every State shall receive reconsideration at reasonable intervals, and that social legislation should be framed by those familiar with the conditions and needs of society, we realize that back of all this splendid effort is an abiding, practical, creative moral ideal. One has but to look around one daily to see on every hand reverential, loving, laboring, self-sacrificing expressions of a common moral ideal.

We have been told frequently and from high station that this was a war to end war. We hope it was. In a sense, it was fought for, of, and by moral ideas. And yet the war itself was a direct product of a totally irrational moral world ideal; or rather, because of an absence of the right compelling moral ideal. War is rooted and developed under the influences of a systematic fomentation, over a wide area, of international suspicions, envies, hatreds. That is the lesson of the war. Out of his reverences, loves, labors, and constructive sacrifices; out of his health and thought, his flesh and spirit, man will construct for himself a better-ordered world because of the clearer visions of his moral ideal which the war has now brought to him. In three concluding papers I shall attempt to show that this moral ideal includes also the aspirations of democracy, the social purpose, and the will to end war.

GERMANY, FRANCE, AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Radicals and German Republic Clash—Ruhr Region Entered by Germany—France Protests and Then Acts—Appeal to the League

In our March issue we described the events in Germany which finally led to the defeat of the Junker uprising against the Ebert Ministry and the Republic and the return to power of the Noske-Ebert combination. Hardly, however, had the reactionaries of the right been defeated when trouble for the government arose from a "Spartacan" uprising of communists. The "White Terror" having been defeated, the "Red Terror" appeared. The uprising took on serious proportions for a time and threatened to overturn the Ebert Ministry. It did compel the retirement of Noske, the Minister of War, and it forced from President Ebert, in conferences held March 19-20, concessions that much strengthened the grip of the Labor Party upon the government.

In the Ruhr region, for a time, the government suffered nothing but reverses, and in its final effort to down the radicals it so massed and used its troops as to excite not only the fear of the Communists, but also of France. She distrusted the surface indications of the combat; she believed that if the government once got a large body of soldiery and arms in the district, even though on the pretext of downing revolt against the government, she would not retire

when the revolt was suppressed. France therefore began to remobilize her forces held near the German border, and by diplomacy she endeavored to induce Great Britain, Italy, and Belgium to act with her if it become necessary to act against Germany, should she even seem to infringe on prohibitions against her use of military force in the Ruhr district. The failure of her associates and allies in the war to respond promptly to her plea and the many signs that she thought she saw on every hand of a disposition to be lenient with Germany and trustful of her word finally led the French Ministry to decide to act alone.

On April 4 the French Government issued the following statement:

"The military measures which the French Government plans have for their sole object the forcing of Germany to respect articles 42 and 44 of the Peace Treaty, which forbid their presence in the zone 50 kilometers east of the Rhine. They are, therefore, exclusively restrictive measures."

The next day a statement reiterating that France had no hostile designs against Germany; that it wished restoration of normal relations, and fully understood the difficulties of the Berlin Government, was published. It claimed, however, that the militarist party had proved all-powerful, and that it had not feared to "infringe the imperative and most solemn stipulations of the Versailles Treaty." The note added:

"The sequence of facts follows: The first request for permission for the entry of extra troops into the Ruhr district was made just after the insurgent movement by the military authorities on March 15. It was renewed from Berlin on March 17, in the name of the legitimate government, by von Haniel, who had remained in Berlin with the consent, at least implied, of the insurgent government.

"All information from the allied missions, and, again, the day before yesterday, from the High Commissioners at Coblenz, does not cease to show that German military intervention is uncalled for by the situation, and it would be attended with the gravest dangers from the point of view of security both for the population and the men in the field."

The note then pointed out that if the German Government had carried out the disarmament clauses of the treaty, there would have been neither the Kapp insurrection nor a Red army in the Ruhr, and said that articles 42 and 44 are an indispensable safeguard such as article I of the Franco-Anglo-American Convention defines as a *casus foederis* insufficient to assure the protection of France. It concludes:

"The situation created by the abrupt offensive of the German troops in the Ruhr obliges the French Government today to consider military measures the execution of which cannot be deferred. The sole object of these measures is to bring Germany to a due respect of the treaty; they are exclusively of coercive and precautionary character."

On the 6th, at 5 a. m., French troops from Morocco, under the leadership of General Degoutte, entered Frankfort and Darmstadt, and a few hours later Homburg, Hanau, and Dieburg and the surrounding country also had been occupied. They did so under orders conforming to the text of the following letter handed to Herr Mayer, the German Chargé in Paris, which said, Premier Millerand speaking:

"By my letter of April 2 I asked you to insist to your government on the withdrawal of the German troops which unduly had penetrated the neutral zone fixed by article 42 of the Treaty of Versailles.

"My request remaining without effect, I have the honor to inform you that the commander-in-chief of the army on the Rhine has received an order to occupy immediately the cities of Frankfort, Homburg, Hanau, Darmstadt, and Dieburg.

"This occupation will end as soon as the German troops shall have completely evacuated the neutral zone."

The same day France sent to the governments of all nations where France is represented diplomatically a statement justifying her action similar in tenor to that cited above.

Germany at once sent forth a statement through Chancellor Mueller, from which we quote:

"The German Government is responsible for the lives and liberties of its countrymen. It, there

"The German Government hopes that the Allied governments will not fail to recognize that Germany is forced [to take this action] by a situation imperatively demanding intervention in districts under its jurisdiction and in which every hour of delay may involve irreparable disaster. It also considers that it is not acting contrary to the spirit of the Peace Treaty, whose stipulations have the purpose of promoting the peace of the world and are surely not opposed to a temporary measure of protection, which has no aggressive tendencies.

"The German Government continues firmly resolved loyally to respect its engagements, but for this purpose the speedy restoration of a state of authority is required in a region where law and order are fundamental and antecedent to conditions for the execution of the most important stipulations of the Peace Treaty."

On the 7th the action of France was formally brought before the conference of ambassadors, which heard a statement of the French position by Premier Millerand and then adjourned to give the governments represented at the conference an opportunity to determine their action. The same day Germany formally appealed her case to the League of Nations, doing so under the provisions of Article XI.

The note which Premier Millerand read to the ambassadors said:

"Before occupying Frankfort, Darmstadt, and other cities, the French Government took great care, as it was bound to do, to inform and consult with the Allies. Many times since the treaty has come into force France has proved its desire to maintain close co-operation with the Allies by waiving its point of view and accepting theirs.

"France was forced to act when faced not only by direct violation of the general stipulations of the Versailles Treaty concerning all the Allies, especially France, owing to its geographical position, but also by the failure of Germany to keep the promise given to her personally by a representative of the German Government in conversations which were engaged in at the request of the latter.

"On March 28 the French Premier declared from the tribune of the Chamber of Deputies that France, which was still awaiting the beginning of the realization of the most urgent reparations, could not delay indefinitely making decisions which were imperative. On March 28 Dr. Goeppert informed the French Government that the German Government had not considered in any way the possibility of sending additional troops to the Ruhr Valley without the authorization of the French Government.

"On April 2 Premier Millerand confirmed to the German chargé d'affaires the decision that the French Government could not, as far as it was concerned, give such authorization unless French troops should be authorized to occupy simultaneously Frankfort, Darmstadt, Homburg, Hanau, and Dieburg.

"On April 3, Dr. Goeppert admitted that Reichswehr troops superior to the effectives fixed by the decision of

August 9, 1919, had penetrated the Ruhr, and asked in the name of the German Government that the formal authorization necessary to that effect be given to the German Government after the act had been accomplished.

"The same day, at Berlin, Under Secretary of State von Haniel informed General Barthelemy, who replaced General Nollet, that the German Government had given entire freedom of action to Commissioner Severing regarding the use of troops concentrated for the purpose of operations in the Ruhr Valley, and assumed the responsibility for their action in the neutral zone.

"The French Government immediately informed its allies of this communication, confirmed by its own information, calling attention to the fact that the German Government was violating article 44 of the treaty—a violation constituting a *casus belli* and expressing the hope that the allied governments would recognize the necessity of immediate action and would lend assistance to France in an effective manner for the execution of military measures which could not be avoided or deferred.

"It was not the first time the French Government had warned its allies of that necessity. As early as March 23 the French Government brought the proposition of occupying Frankfort and other cities before the council in London, which expressed the opinion on March 25 that the moment was not timely.

"The German Government addressed itself directly to the French Government to obtain authorization to send troops to the Ruhr Valley. The French Government had no reason to authorize such infraction of the treaty, inasmuch as its own information concurred with that of its allies in deciding that the military occupation of the Ruhr was useless and dangerous.

"Facts demonstrate that the initiative in that operation must be attributed to the German military party. It was Kapp's government which took the initiative. It was the military party, which, despite the strong objections brought forward in the German Government itself against the projected intervention, affirmed the impossibility of re-establishing order without additional troops in the Ruhr.

"France was thus faced with a measure which, in the unanimous opinion of the allies, could not be executed without previous authorization, which was not justified by the circumstances, and which the German Government had taken a formal engagement toward France never to attempt without its authorization.

"The measure took an especially serious aspect, owing to the fact that the allies had been unable to obtain, despite their insistence, execution of the clauses of the treaty relative to German disarmament.

"The French Government thus acted in the general interest, as well as in the interest of France; it was necessary that it should take, in accordance with the Treaty of Versailles, a measure indispensable to its own security. There is no need to recall that it is resolved to evacuate the occupied cities as soon as the German troops have completely quit the Ruhr.

"The French Government's attitude is justified by the action of the German Government. It does not modify, however, its dispositions toward Germany, with which it hopes to enter into commercial relations on a basis of economic co-operation, from which the European situation can only benefit.

"France, in taking measures for the occupation, was not inspired by hostile thought toward Germany, and reiterates the assurance that it wishes to renew with Germany as soon as possible normal relations on a basis of economic agreement. It expresses its readiness to receive favorably any serious proposal which might come from Germany, in view of the fact that under certain circumstances France might even take the initiative in that direction."

FRANCE AND THE ALLIES' ATTITUDE

On April 8 a statement was sent forth from the British authorities, following a conference between the French ambassador and Premier Lloyd-George. It was to the effect

that France, in invading the Ruhr district, acted entirely on her own initiative; that Great Britain, the United States, Italy, and Belgium were all opposed to the plan, and that France's action had caused a delicate situation. France's good faith in acting as she had was admitted in this statement, but it was added, by way of comment:

"The immediate result is that the responsibility for her action cannot be shared by the allies as a whole, and certainly there is no intention on the part of the British Government to allow British soldiers to act as police between hostile German factions and incur all the odium of such a position, to say nothing of its risks."

The statement concludes:

"If, and when, France's suspicions of Germany's ulterior motives and deliberate flaunting of the terms of the peace treaty become accomplished facts, the allies would doubtless be prepared to act instantly and vigorously in concert to vindicate the position and respect for the provisions of the treaty. But for the time being it may be taken that no British soldier will participate in the occupation of German cities in the neutral zone."

The same day it was intimated from Brussels that Belgium was not arrayed against France and would join her in occupation of German territory. On the 9th this proved to be a fact, since a battalion of Belgian troops was added to the French forces and the Belgian railways were put at the service of France.

As for the United States, reports from Paris on the 10th indicate that the Washington Government had asked France for a statement of her intentions, but had not delivered any ultimatum or formal decision.

FRANCE FURTHER EXPOUNDS HER ARGUMENT

On April 10 Premier Millerand, eager to meet the criticism of public opinion beyond France, issued the following statement of the Republic's case:

"France's position is absolutely simple. We were in the presence of a series of German violations of the treaty, the last of which affects precisely those articles of the treaty which were covered by the French-British-American agreement, under which England and America were to come to our assistance.

"I enumerated to the French Chamber on March 26 the German violations—failure to deliver coal as agreed under the treaty, refusal to surrender those guilty of atrocities, failure to comply with the terms of the articles on reparations, and refusal to disarm. I said then that France could not always accept passively violations of the treaty.

"The German Government asked permission to send troops into the Ruhr. Why? Because they knew that the sending of troops into that region was forbidden by the treaty. We refused to give that permission. Nevertheless, the German Government ordered troops into the Ruhr. The only thing possible for us to do was immediately to occupy Frankfort and the other German cities.

"We had given notice to our allies that we intended to do so and they had not objected. Our information was absolutely clear and authoritative that the sending of troops into the Ruhr district was not necessary in the interest of public order. They were being sent there simply as an infraction of the treaty.

"France's position is quite different from that of America and England. We are living next door to Germany, and we feel the danger of our position in a way in which America could not feel it. Why has Belgium taken an identical position with France? Because the Belgian people are in the same dangerous situation. They are living next door to Germany and are obliged to protect themselves."

FRANCE REPLIES TO GREAT BRITAIN

On April 10 France sent the following communication to Great Britain:

"The French Government affirms first of all that no doubt can be felt of the loyalty of its attitude. The allies have been constantly informed of its policy. The French Government has always opposed the entry of supplementary German troops into the Ruhr region and has added that the authorization for such an entry must have a counterpart in the occupation of Frankfort and Darmstedt.

"On April 3 its representatives in all the allied capitals informed the governments to which they were accredited (at the same time a copy being sent to the allied representatives in Paris) that Marshal Foch's measures could no longer be postponed. Furthermore, the French Government recalled that the matter concerned the violation of one of the most solemn clauses of the treaty signed by France, and that the German Government had formally recognized that formal authorization, given in advance, was necessary for such a derogation, and that France had the right to ask for territorial guarantees.

"How could the Government of France have been satisfied with the German promise to withdraw the troops when order had been restored? Neither for reparation nor for the delivery of the war-guilty, nor for coal have the allies received the stipulated satisfaction.

"The question could be asked when the British Government, which no doubt has not measured the danger of these systematic violations, would step in the path of concessions. France, in any case, was obliged to say, 'That is enough.'

"The French Government is no less convinced than the English Government of the essential necessities of maintaining unity of the allies for the application of the treaty with Germany. This close concert of France and England appears to France equally indispensable for the equitable solution of the vast problems which are presented at this moment in the world—in Russia, the Baltic, Asia Minor, and all Islam."

The note closes with assurances that the French Government, for the promotion of these ends, declares itself entirely disposed, before acting, to be assured of the consent of the allies in all interrelated questions which the execution of the treaty raises.

The text of the sections of the Versailles Treaty under which France assumed authority to act independently of the Allies is as follows:

"Article 42. Germany is forbidden to maintain or construct any fortifications either on the left bank of the Rhine or on the right bank to the west of a line drawn fifty kilometers to the east of the Rhine.

"Article 43. In the area defined above the maintenance and the assembly of armed forces, either permanently or temporarily, and military maneuvers of any kind, as well as the upkeep of all permanent works for mobilization, are in the same way forbidden.

"Article 44. In case Germany violates in any manner whatever the provisions of articles 42 and 43, she shall be regarded as committing a hostile act against the powers signatory of the present treaty and as well calculated to disturb the peace of the world."

STATUS OF AMERICAN TROOPS

The status of the American troops on the Rhine, numbering on March 26, 726 officers and 16,756 privates, was defined by President Wilson in a communication sent to Congress April 1. He said:

"The American forces in Germany are at present operating under the terms of the original armistice and the subsequent convention prolonging the armistice. After the formation of the Rhineland Commission, the question arose

as to whether its ordinances should govern in the American sector and the representatives of the State Department and the commanding general of the American forces in Germany were instructed as follows:

"This government cannot admit jurisdiction of that commission over portions of Rhenish provinces occupied by the American forces. Consequently, neither you (representatives of the State Department) nor General Allen should issue any ordinances which conflict with or exceed the terms of the armistice, which the department (of state) regards as continuing in force as to the United States. You should, however, maintain the closest touch with the high commission and endeavor in so far as possible to conform administrative régime within territory occupied by American forces to régime adopted by high commission for other portions of occupied territory. There is no objection to your sitting informally with high commission, provided you are requested to do so, nor of continuing your activities, as well as those of your staff, in connection with special committees to handle distribution of coal, etc. Ordinances, orders, regulations, etc., relating to financial and economic matters, including those similar to one adopted by high commission, which it is desired to put into force in territory occupied by American forces should be issued by General Allen as commanding general of American forces in Germany, but only after having first been approved by you. In general, endeavor to cooperate fully with high commission and avoid all friction with that body, while at same time make it perfectly clear that you are still operating under the armistice.

On April 12 the United States issued a statement to the effect that "an informal exchange of advices between the United States and the Allies on the Ruhr Valley decision had taken place, and it is hoped that the *status quo* will be restored without serious lesions."

CONGRESS AND THE PEACE TREATY

Action of the Executive with respect to the League of Nations Covenant and the Treaty of Peace, since we chronicled last month the Senate's second rejection of the treaty, has been confined to quasi-official statements intimating that any action taken by the House in an effort to terminate war would be blocked by him with a veto if necessary. There also have been reports that the President intends to return the treaty to the Senate; and also rumors that when the House's joint resolution to end the war comes before the Senate it will be the subject of amendments calculated by the Democrats who oppose the measure to make the resolution unpopular, whether the amendments are adopted or rejected.

On the other hand, in the House there has been a serious debate and a very important vote, the meaning of which we comment upon editorially. First approved by a majority of the Foreign Relations Committee of the House, then given a place on the debate list, and finally enacted April 9, the joint resolution was passed in the following form:

Joint resolution terminating the state of war declared to exist April 6, 1917, between the Imperial German Government and the United States, permitting on conditions the resumption of reciprocal trade with Germany, and for other purposes.

Whereas the President of the United States, in the performance of his constitutional duty to give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, has advised the Congress that the war with the Imperial German Government has ended:

Resolved, etc., That the state of war declared to exist

between the Imperial German Government and the United States by the joint resolution of Congress approved April 6, 1917, is hereby declared at an end.

SEC. 2. That in the interpretation of any provision relating to the date of the termination of the present war or of the present or existing emergency in any acts of Congress, joint resolutions, or proclamations of the President containing provisions contingent upon the date of the termination of the war or of the present or existing emergency, the date when this resolution becomes effective shall be construed and treated as the date of the termination of the war or of the present or existing emergency, notwithstanding any provision in any act of Congress or joint resolution providing any other mode of determining the date of the termination of the war or of the present or existing emergency.

SEC. 3. That with a view to secure reciprocal trade with the German Government and its nationals, and for this purpose, it is hereby provided that unless within 45 days from the date when this resolution becomes effective the German Government shall duly notify the President of the United States that it has declared a termination of the war with the United States and that it waives and renounces on behalf of itself and its nationals any claim, demand, right, or benefit against the United States or its nationals that it or they would not have had the right to assert had the United States ratified the treaty of Versailles, the President of the United States shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, to proclaim the fact that the German Government has not given the notification hereinbefore mentioned, and thereupon and until the President shall have proclaimed the receipt of such notification commercial intercourse between the United States and Germany and the making of loans or credits and the furnishing of financial assistance or supplies to the German Government or the inhabitants of Germany, directly or indirectly, by the Government or the inhabitants of the United States shall, except with the license of the President, be prohibited.

SEC. 4. That whoever shall willfully violate the foregoing prohibition whenever the same shall be in force shall upon conviction be fined not more than \$10,000, or, if a natural person, imprisoned for not more than two years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation shall be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both, and any property, funds, securities, papers, or other articles or documents, or any vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, concerned in such violation, shall be forfeited to the United States.

SEC. 5. That nothing herein contained shall be construed as a waiver by the United States of any rights, privileges, indemnities, reparations, or advantages to which the United States has become entitled under the terms of the armistice signed November 11, 1918, or which were acquired by or are in the possession of the United States by reason of its participation in the war, or otherwise, and all fines, forfeitures, penalties, and seizures imposed or made by the United States are hereby ratified, confirmed, and maintained.

The vote by which this resolution passed was 242 yeas and 150 nays, two answering "present" and 33 members not voting. With but very few exceptions, both in the debate and in the voting, the alignment was according to party lines, the Republicans voting for and the Democrats against the resolution.

On April 12 the resolution was received by the Senate, and was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee without discussion. It will be ten days at least, probably, before the resolution is reported out.

On April 14 Senator McCumber, of North Dakota, introduced a resolution to be substituted for the House resolution. It provides for trade with Germany, but makes no reference to the treaty and would be no bar to its ratification. It reflects the attitude of the "mild reservationists."

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

The annual meeting of the American section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, in session in Chicago, April 23-24, has been discussing important details of reconstruction of its administrative machinery, revision of its constitution, choice of headquarters, and the employment of a salaried executive. A report of its deliberations we will publish next month. In the official call for this gathering it was stated:

In 1915 we declared that as women we desired to serve this great cause of just and permanent peace because "as women we felt a peculiar revolt against the cruelty and waste of war"; and although we would not prolong the segregated efforts of the sexes for social ends we felt that we women, so long ignored in all choices that made war, might strengthen each other best for protest and effort if we could have an inner circle of devotion of our very own in the many-sided international movement.

Today, in 1920, the fruits of "collective homicide" are before us. The ruthless sacrifice of life, of health, of treasure, of childhood asset of the future generations, of the feeling of human brotherhood, and the will to live at peace with all men—these are beyond any loss the most frightful dream could picture.

And in our own land the reactionary influences hold us back at once from any adequate relief of the world's misery and from any effective reorganization of the forces of normal life to prevent a continuance of war and preparation for future war.

More than this, we are suffering from hysterical fear and suspicion, one class of another, that lead to denial of the constitutional rights of free speech, free press, and free assembly, that lead to cruel and senseless raids and deportations, and that threaten the inmost defenses of our democratic ideals. We, therefore, lack the guidance of that many-sided truth that "above all things, in open struggle with error, always beareth away the victory." We are on the verge of a presidential campaign. We have millions of new voters among the women of this land. We have great bodies of organized womanhood already pledged to philanthropic effort, to educational advance, to better labor conditions, to full legal rights of women and the saving of child life, and to a finer political method and spirit of action. All that these women are pledged to accomplish may be nullified in a moment when men are set to kill one another by wholesale as the most sacred of duties.

Unless the women now invested with full power and responsibility of citizenship can rise to the supreme need of the hour, the need for clear thinking and fearless speaking concerning these ordered ways of legal and political, of commercial and industrial, of educational and social organization of world interests to the end of just and permanent peace, they are building upon the sand.

However strong a hold the "mysticism of militarism" still has upon the common imagination, those who have suffered most during these last years have learned that we must not have another world war. They understand that we must end the fragments of little wars that still further ravage desolate and bankrupt nations. We all are convinced that we must learn a better way of living and working together. Men and women in comradeship must find and make straight that way. But women—women of all races and peoples—may well for a while at least work somewhat by themselves until they become strong and commanding in their power of motherhood to declare that this obsolete legalizing of human slaughter must be outgrown.

The program of this section of this international organization, as defined by the executive board at its meeting in New York, March 4, 1920, was as follows:

1. Fight the world famine (a) by philanthropic contributions and government loans; (b) by spreading information concerning the lamentable conditions in starving Europe.

2. Stand for our constitutional rights of free speech, free press, free assembly, and minority representation in legislature.

3. Support bills for universal physical education without military training; oppose military training in our schools and compulsory military service.

4. Urge through all official channels the repatriation of all prisoners of war, especially the many thousands languishing in Siberia.

5. Protest against the spirit and methods of "raids" and seizure for deportation and exile, and do all in our power to allay the hysteria and panic which make these possible.

6. Appeal for the immediate release from prison of political offenders whose only offense is opposition to war.

7. Permeate the Americanization movement with the spirit of appreciation of the gifts of many races to our national life.

8. If the League of Nations Covenant is signed by the United States, work for its amendment along lines of equality of rights among nations and true union of peoples to abolish war. If it is not signed, work for the third Hague Conference and a better League of Nations.

9. Support morally and financially the international headquarters at Geneva and circulate the publications of the Women's International League.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

OPPOSITION TO RECOGNITION OF SOVIET-CONTROLLED Russia by the United States Government was expressed in a petition to President Wilson, March 28, the signers being 300 citizens of eminence, mainly of the trading, manufacturing, professional, and "moderate" reformer groups. The signers said that they believed that

"recognition of Soviet Russia would be a repudiation of all that our national life has represented for 150 years and of all the spiritual ideals for which modern civilization has striven for 2,000 years.

"Aiming to destroy the bulwarks of morality and social order, soviet tenets have attempted to interdict the teaching of religion, disfranchised the clergy, and made marriage a mere civil contract which may be broken by either party. Its system and franchise destroy representative government, which, since the Magna Charta, the world has come to regard as the first essential political factor of the modern state. Its program breaks every law of economics and in practice destroys production.

"The fundamental principle and purpose of the Bolshevik propaganda abroad is world revolution, whether that propaganda is carried on by official soviet representatives, by political parties which belong to their communist international, or by independent organizations that support sovietism because of its temporary ability to maintain its power. Bolshevism by all of its decrees, publications, and acknowledged acts has demonstrated that it is a destructive movement, depending for its success in Russia upon terrorism and a minority dictatorship, and in foreign countries upon support and sympathy obtained through propaganda. Zinoviev himself, while president of the Petrograd Soviet, declared that the very existence of the Soviet régime is a menace to all other governments.

"Where government is most stable, as in America, every element of disloyalty, disorder, and discontent is stimulated by this propaganda. Where government is unstable, as in Germany, revolutionists are subsidized and aided and an early soviet revolution is confidently reckoned upon. Even

if only temporarily successful, such an overturn, which might become an upheaval in all Central Europe, would be a world calamity. Civilization must face and meet this deadly challenge. Concessions of any kind whatever can only encourage the enemy.

"With the recognition of the soviet régime, the presence of an Ambassador and consular agents enjoying immunities (each a center of intrigue), the propaganda of the Lenin-Trotsky régime against civilization, already working through so many radical and pseudo-liberal organizations, and recently augmented by an endless stream of inspired press stories from Moscow and Petrograd, would be further ramified and dangerously extended. It is their declared intention first to undermine and then to gain control of the organized labor unrest, the stimulation of 'strikes of protest' into general political strikes and then into revolutionary mass action for the conquest of the State.'

"Thus we have in our own country, waging deadly and underground warfare against us, an enemy more dangerous and with objects infinitely more far-reaching and inimical than was Imperial Germany with her host of agents and spies.

"We therefore believe that the people of the United States, acting through their Government at Washington, should now, once and for all, declare that they cannot consent to admit into the family of nations or in any other way countenance this 'government' of violence and terror.

"There must be no compromise between American democracy and Russian Bolshevism."

THE INTERNATIONAL WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE ALLIANCE, which was to have held its first meeting since the assembly in Bucharest in 1913, in the capital of Spain, has now been summoned to meet in Geneva, June 6-12. The influences thwarting the Madrid plan at the last moment were in part political and in part ecclesiastical. As with the organization of equal suffragists in the United States at their last meeting so with this Geneva conference; the main business will be to decide on a future policy and name inasmuch as so much of Europe and America has been won to the principle and practice of sex equality in civic rights. Some members—to quote from an article by Ida Husted Harper in the *New York Evening Post*—urge disbanding. Others would merge the organization with the International Council of Women. Yet others, following the British and American example, would maintain the autonomy of the alliance, but broaden its range of action, by drawing up a woman's charter for the world and then contending for it. Incidentally an alliance so organized would watch the operations of the League of Nations and see that the provisions laid down as governing it are practically applied with the same equality in choice of the League's agents that the covenant provides for. The proposed alliance also would see that women are properly represented in the International Labor Department of the League; and that wherever mandates are given, in backward regions of the world, women's rights are protected.

Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the Alliance, in her call for this gathering, said:

"I want to add my solicitation to theirs that the eighth congress will see our old-time band of international suffragists reunited without a break; that the old-time spirit

of comradeship and world helpfulness will be as sincere and unselfish as ever; that the confidence in the fundamental good sense of the average of the people of all nationalities is still unshaken; and that the hope in the ultimate peace, harmony, and progress of the world still lives in the souls of all to inspire and to lead us on.

"Many of us have literally given our 'lives and fortunes' to secure for our sex a ballot's share in the making of the public welfare of our respective nations. That ballot has been won over a large part of the civilized world since last we met. Women, children, and the home as well as the general welfare of our several countries will be safer and saner if the women who have sacrificed their all to win the vote shall now counsel together as to the wisest way to use it for the common good of all.

"Let us therefore meet once more, not only as friends, but as guardians of the great democratic liberty now intrusted to the women of many nations.

"The world never needed women as it needs them now nor were women ever so well equipped to serve. Can we not vow together that neither the suspicion and hatred born of war, nor the selfish bitterness grown out of our own war experiences, shall blind our eyes to the higher vision of women of all nations working together to achieve a higher civilization for each and every land."

CZECHO-SLOVAKIAN NATIONALISM is not to be of chauvinistic, egoistic kind, if President Masaryk has his way. In a recent speech to the National Assembly of the young State he said:

"It is the duty of our (Czecho-Slovak) public men to grasp the organization and development of the whole human race. It is our duty to synchronize our national aspirations with the aspirations of mankind.

"There is one rule for us to follow in the economic and political interests of the Republic—to pursue a European, a humanitarian, and a world policy, and thus be truly Czecho-Slovak and Slavic.

"Within the bounds of our country we have considerable portions of other nationalities, and this affords us an opportunity to make our Republic an excellent example of true humanitarian practice.

"The language question and the natural difficulties involved in its solution should not frighten us. For a modern democratic State, language is significant only in administration. We will correctly solve the problems of languages and minorities if we make them questions not of politics, as was the case in Austria-Hungary, but proper subjects of administration."

JAPANESE OCCUPATION OF THE CITY OF VLADIVOSTOK, Siberia, April 4, was not accomplished without use of force, adherents of the "provisional government" resisting. Japan's claims prior to the action were summarized in a call by General Takayanagi for compliance with the following demands:

To furnish food, transportation, and barracks for the Japanese; to ratify all agreements between the Japanese and the Russian governments and commanders; immunity of all supporting Japanese military movement; avoidance of any anti-Japanese movements, including any threatening demonstrations in connection with Manchuria and Korea; suppress-

sion also of any anti-Japanese subjects, including their lives, property, and other rights.

The real major reason for this step, in which Japan evidently is to have the backing of her Allies in the war, and also the United States, is to keep control of the port of entry for eastern Siberia and prevent it from passing into the hands of the Bolshevik rulers of Russia and their adherents in Siberia. The Powers evidently argue that, until the basis of commercial and political understanding with Russia is decided upon formally and they are ready to act concertedly one way or the other, they must not fail to keep control of the strategic port. Japan, late in March, had gone on record pledging herself to withdraw her troops from Siberia as soon as the Czecho-Slavic army had been retired. The last of the American troops are now out of Siberia, General Graves and his staff who were the last to go, getting an ovation from the Russians as they left.

JAPAN'S GENERAL ELECTIONS IN MAY are to be of historic importance, as all her leading statesmen and the best-informed foreign observers in Japan realize. The issues of militarism vs. militarism, freedom of restriction of speech and publication, limited or universal suffrage, amity with or hostility to China, and sincere co-operation with or secret opposition to the United States are all involved in the decision. For this reason the following utterance of Premier Takashi Hara, made to the pro-government party March 17, is unusually significant. When he took office a year ago he was looked upon as quite radical. Being a "commoner," it was supposed that he would lead in the progressive democratic evolution of the country. But the pace has been too fast for him. He is now a "Moderate," with leanings toward the Right rather than the Left, as his speech indicates. He said:

"Universal suffrage, advocated by the opposition, aims at the destruction of social class distinction, and even proposes to tamper with the conscription system, which is the very basis of the country's defense, if speeches in the House of Deputies serve as an index.

"A ridiculous rumor is in circulation that the Seiyu-kai will purchase votes, and that the party, abusing government authority, will contrive to so manage matters as to score over the opposition. It need hardly be stated that we will fight always on the basis of fairness and policy."

LIBERALIZING DENMARK'S POLITICAL STRUCTURE was a process that King Christian had to face, willy nilly, during the interval between March 20 and April 5. He had the alternative of doing so or losing his throne, and he naturally chose the course that his people preferred. The demand of the Social Democrats for electoral reform was the basic cause of the uprising, not his interference with a cabinet that had the confidence of the people; but the movement finally became general, included the many parties with liberal and democratic leanings, and it compassed its end by a threat of a general strike. The King has kept his pledge, made after an all-night face-to-face session with the party leaders, and the cabinet now in control is chiefly made up of Social Democrats with administrative experience as well as advanced political theories. The fight for electoral

reform in Denmark goes back to 1914 and was directed mainly at the upper house. Just as the war opened a law was carried giving an elective basis to this body; but conservative influences blocked putting the law into effect.

GUATEMALA'S INTERNAL AFFAIRS for several years have been the most troubled of any of the Central American States, owing to the arbitrary attitude of Estrada Cabrera, its President. Pressure from within and from without the Republic has recently led this executive to pledge that in the elections of 1922 all rights guaranteed citizens by the constitution will be fully recognized by him, and independent action by voters will not be followed by interference with their liberty, as in the past. Commenting upon this welcome change of attitude, the Government of the United States, through Minister Benton McMillin, has issued the following statement:

"The steady policy of the Government of the United States is to encourage constitutional government and free elections in Central America. Having interest, therefore, in the constitutional progress of Guatemala, the Government of the United States has learned with pleasure of the proclamation of President Estrada Cabrera regarding constitutional guarantees and has confidence, in view of the statements just made to the government by President Cabrera, that he will faithfully carry out the reforms proclaimed.

"The Government of the United States is opposed to revolutionary measures, and firmly believes, in view of President Cabrera's proclamation, there is no excuse for starting a revolutionary measure in Guatemala."

THE FUTURE OF UKRAINE, with its 330,000 square miles of territory and its 40,000,000 population and untouched enormous physical resources, is one of the problems that neither the Allies nor the United States has squarely faced. American governmental influence, like the European, has been cool toward doing anything aiding political disintegration of Russia; but the Ukrainian Commission, representing 1,000,000 Ukrainians living in the United States, has steadily worked for recognition of the new State by the United States, claiming that its people and present rulers are quite ready to have its boundaries settled by a plebiscite or by an impartial American and Allied commission. They are willing to assume 30 per cent of the Russian debt as it existed prior to the Revolution of 1917. As yet, the President and Department of State have not acted favorably on this petition of the Ukrainians in the United States; but Senator King, of Utah, has introduced a bill in Congress which, if enacted, will give to Ukraine the same sort of support that reconstituted Poland, Jugo-Slavia, and Czecho-Slavia have had from the United States.

EDUCATING THE CHILDREN OF HER FALLEN SOLDIERS is the way Western Australia has decided to memorialize the dead who helped defeat Germany. A *Christian Science Monitor* correspondent in Perth says that the plan, approved by the people, had its roots in the decisions of a picked group of educators assembled two years ago. The correspondent says:

"A Soldiers' Children Scholarship Trust includes in its personnel the State Governor, as chairman, the Lieutenant-

Governor, the Chief Justice, the Minister for Education, and representatives of the Returned Soldiers' Association, and the Friendly Union of Soldiers' Wives. The objects of the trust are:

"(a) To arrange for the business, secondary, higher technical, and university education of the children of fallen and incapacitated soldiers by means of free scholarships;

"(b) To arrange for the professional employment of students so educated when desired;

"(c) To arrange for the employment of students educated in business colleges;

"(d) To arrange for apprenticeship to selected trades and businesses where desired.

"At present a total of 126 scholarships is available, the tenures varying from one to five years. One hundred of the scholarships are granted annually, and 27 every three years. The total capital value of the scholarships is nearly £300,000, and the annual tenure value £10,000. Scholarships to the value of over £12,000 have been already allotted, and the number of children under instruction is 120. It is anticipated that the beneficiaries will number between 2,000 and 3,000, and that the scheme will be worked out in about 30 years."

THE RUSSIAN SOCIETY FOR THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, with headquarters in Paris and made up mainly of anti-Bolshevists, has issued the following document, signed by many former members of the Constitutional-Democrat party and by members of the Provisional Government that followed the downfall of the Czar, men like Prince G. Lvoff, L. I. Petrunkevich, Nicholas V. Tchakovsky, and by Catherine Breshkovsky, the "Grandmother of the Russian Revolution." These persons say:

"(1) Only States which are based upon the principle of popular rule may become members of the League.

"(2) The representation of the members of the League in all principal organs to be based upon democratic principles.

"(3) War to be definitely excluded from the means of settling international disputes, and all conflicts between States to be decided by an international court or through the organs of the League of Nations.

"(4) The League must realize the idea of general disarmament and be endowed with a real force for the enactment of its decisions.

"(5) The League must seek methods and create required organs for the strengthening of the principles of economic solidarity and co-operation between nations and likewise the rendering of broad economic and financial aid to those countries which have suffered the greatest losses in the World War, for the purpose of their quickest material rehabilitation.

"(6) The League, through its proper organs, must fulfill the aim of the establishment and codification of the rules of international law.

"(7) The League must aid in the international solution of social problems, particularly problems of labor legislation.

"(8) The League must guarantee the protection of the freedom of person and the principal rights of civil liberties in all respects.

"(9) The League must create the guarantee of the inviolability of the rights of national minorities and co-operate in the just realization of the principle of self-determination of nations and the establishment of orderly and free national self-expression.

"(10) The League must follow unswervingly the principle of regarding as null and void all secret treaties and all such which are incompatible with its aims."

ARMENIA'S FRIENDS in the United States, banded together in the Committee for the Independence of Armenia, on March 2, issued the following appeal:

"To Our Fellow-Countrymen:

"The Allied premiers in London have tentatively planned the following partition of Armenian territories:

"They propose to divide Armenia into four unequal parts. Its Mediterranean littoral, its richest portion, has been assigned to France; its central provinces have been annexed to a proposed Kurdish State under British protection. Its northwestern portions have been left under Turkish sovereignty.

"And what remains of it is made into an Armenian Republic, which comprises about one-tenth of Turkish Armenia and parts of Russian Armenia. Proposed Armenia, thus shut off from her littorals on both the Black and Mediterranean seas and robbed of her chief resources, cannot achieve real independence or self-support as a nation.

"It is our duty to make a solemn appeal to the liberal opinion of the world to join us in the demand that the rule of the Turk be brought to an end in Armenia, and that Armenia, from Ararat down to the Cilician coast, be given unlimited opportunity for autonomous development.

"For over three-quarters of a century Armenia has been the object of our special solicitude. Since 1915 we have given tens of millions of dollars for the relief of her people in the hope that the promises for the independence of Armenia would be fulfilled. We led the Armenians to believe that their case would be whole-heartedly defended by us, and they now look to us to secure full justice.

"Therefore we urge that meetings be held throughout America to protest against the declamation of Armenia, and the churches, civic, commercial, and other bodies and all citizens telegraph the President, their Senators and Congressmen, to the end that this ancient martyr-nation may be liberated and preserved."

On Congress this appeal had no effect. In the period just before the vote that caused a second rejection of the Peace Treaty, when special friends of Egypt, Ireland, China, and other nations were introducing their resolutions insisting on more or less "self-determination" for them as "nationalities," no voice was raised for Armenia. Nor has the resolution "fathered" by Senator King of Utah and referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, March 3, ever been reported out. The congressional attitude has been one of "waiting" until it was made clear just what the European powers planned to do in the matter of keeping pledges and repudiating secret treaties, and the State Department has confined itself to letting Europe know that there was little hope of the United States assenting to mandatory control of Turkey or of Armenia.

LATIN-AMERICAN PLANS for a distinct policy, separate from the United States and any implications of the Monroe Doctrine, are hinted at in a communication

planned to be despatched to the States of Central and South America by Salvador in March, the same being the formal decree of the national legislature. It is now said that premature publication in Mexico held up formal sending of the note. It read:

"The executive is hereby authorized to address the chancelleries of the Latin-American countries, through whatever instrumentalities he may deem most suitable, with a view to bringing to their knowledge and consideration the establishment of a court of arbitration to settle international difficulties of any nature arising among the signatory powers, subject to the following conditions:

"1. Each of the signatory powers shall name, through its respective legislative branch, a judicial representative, who shall serve for the period fixed by its constitution. The seat of the court shall be chosen by the governments.

"2. The signatory powers shall submit to the court all questions that might give rise to international complications whenever they cannot be settled by the members involved. In the event of a conflict arising between the signatory powers and another nation not signatory to the court, and no agreement having been reached, the signatory powers shall place all the documents in the case at the disposal of the court, which shall proceed as it deems best toward the settlement of the difficulty.

"If, unfortunately, this friendly settlement should fail, notice thereof shall be given to the signatory powers, so that they make common cause and order the closing of their ports to the trade of the offending country, and should this not prove adequate they shall be bound to render assistance with their land and sea forces. The country benefited shall be obliged to bear the expenses according to its resources and in the discretion of the court.

"3. The court shall aid in the construction of ships among the signatory powers which do not now possess them; these shall be devoted in times of peace to trade purposes and during the war to coastwise defense.

"4. Should civil war break out in a signatory power the court may intervene to bring about a cessation of the horrors whenever it shall deem it necessary, and the other powers shall lend their aid as may be determined.

"5. The court shall devote special attention to the enactment of adequate uniform legislation among the signatory powers and to stimulating the friendliest possible relations.

"6. The executive is hereby authorized to offer the capital of the Republic to the other nations in the event that no other be chosen, for the first meeting, and to pay the necessary expenses.

"7. Immediately after the installation of the Latin-American court, the Central American Court of Justice of Cartago, the International Bureau of Guatemala, and the International Bureau of American Republics (the Pan-American Union), with its seat in Washington, shall cease to function should the court so decide."

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE becomes a most vital phase of post-war business whenever and wherever the nations fight. The histories of the past have paid little attention to this fact, most chroniclers conceiving it to be their duty to tell about the political and military consequences of the combats. What the masses who have

fought and paid taxes and what the controllers of loanable funds have done usually has been deemed of little consequence. But this war has altered the situation. Grave as are the internal difficulties and disputes which the victors and the defeated nations face, they are insignificant compared with the problem of preserving and conserving Europe's credit and making provision for ultimate extinction of her debt. It is not surprising, therefore, that the chambers of commerce of the nations that were associated in defeating Germany have arranged for a world session to be held in Paris in May, and that a world's financial conference, to which forty nations are to be asked to send delegates, has been called to meet in Brussels also during May, and this under the auspices of the League of Nations. The list of nations invited to the Brussels conference is more inclusive than the chambers of commerce list and includes the neutral as well as all the belligerent powers. The plan calls for the fullest and frankest statements by the governments of these countries as to their budgets.

LETTER BOX

AUBURNDALE, MASS., April 6, 1920.

EDITOR ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

DEAR SIR: I write to express the pleasure I have received in the recent numbers of the paper. I hope that you will go on and make this periodical the most dignified and many-sided of all papers devoted to the work of world organization, according to the lines marked out in recent numbers.

I am especially interested in Prof. H. A. Smith's article in the March number. I confess that I have become a convert to the idea that the use of force to bring in world organization is impracticable.

Enclosed find check for \$1.50 to pay for subscription to the *ADVOCATE* for one year (here the writer gives the address of a society in Massachusetts).

HORACE DUTTON,

DENTON, TEXAS.

EDITOR ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

DEAR SIR: The front page of your magazine bears the following words: "Advocate of Peace through Justice." These are ponderous words which few understand. Is the natural man capable of reaching a high standard of justice without help from above? The natural man is greedy, rapacious, and will stop at no obstacle to accumulate his pile unless he is governed by a higher law which is found in the message of Christ. All human schemes with Christ left out are bubbles. If the world were to put on the spirit of the World Teacher and Redeemer, then it would hasten to be just to all—to the foreigner, the individual, the corporation. No tyranny would be possible at home or toward foreign nations. All this is possible through the Gospel, which tells us that we are all brothers and children of one Father.

Would it not be a short cut to domestic and international peace to erect schools the world over in which the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man would be the main study? Would not such schools benefit the world more than the military ones? Can morality and the higher laws be taught in barracks? How many such schools could have been erected with the money spent in the last war, which put this globe on the brink of ruin and put the flower of manhood in the grave?

God gave us reason to govern the world in such a way that it would be a joy for heaven to look upon. In what state do the angels see us now? Are we not a distressing sight to them?

RAYMOND VERNIMONT,
Catholic Priest.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF MOTHERS AND
PARENT-TEACHER ASSOCIATIONS,
WASHINGTON, D. C., April 8, 1920.

MR. ARTHUR DEERIN CALL.

MY DEAR MR. CALL: I have read the last number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* with a great deal of interest and warm approval of the attitude of this magazine on the League of Nations and the peace treaty and on compulsory military training.

I wish to congratulate you on such an excellent number of the magazine. I hope that you will use your influence in preventing the passage of the military bills that are now before Congress. I have secured the co-operation of the League of Women Voters and the National Council of Women, representing thirty-one national organizations, who have promised to use their influence against them.

I have also secured their hearty endorsement of and their promise to work for the physical education bill, which has been introduced by the Physical Education Service of the Bureau of Education. If this bill passes it will provide good physical training for all boys and girls.

I heard General Wood say in an address given at Battle Creek, Mich., that the army would take all the boys at eighteen years of age and make them physically fit. I believe that it is not the business of the army to take up educational work which should cover the years before eighteen; that we should not have to make over our boys.

Very truly yours,

(MRS. F.) H. R. SCHOFF,
President.

3418 Baring Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Correspondence with Mexican Youth

Mary N. Chase, secretary for the Promotion of International Amity in Proctor Academy, Andover, N. H., has recently started correspondence with pupils in Friends schools in C. Victoria, Mexico. At the suggestion of Ambassador Y. Bonillas, letters have been sent to thirty-six governors in Mexico regarding such correspondence. The following letter from General José E. Santos, governor of Nuevo Leon, has been received:

MONTERREY, NUEVO LEON, March 17, 1920.

MISS MARY N. CHASE,
Andover, N. H., U. S. A.

RESPECTED MADAM: I received with much pleasure and read with unusual interest your courteous letter of the 8th inst., which by the suggestion of Ambassador Bonillas you addressed to me.

Being advised of the object which your society is promoting, I am pleased to inform you that I am arranging to make public the purposes of the Society for the Promotion of International Amity. In fact, I have already sent your courteous letter to the State Director General of Primary Instruction, since the aim of such a society is of the noblest character, inasmuch as it tends to effect a rapprochement (bringing together) and a good understanding between the people of the United States and Mexico.

Please accept the assurance of my highest regard.

(Signed) JOSÉ E. SANTOS.

A Committee on Mexican Relations has been formed in Proctor Academy and a Mexican student in Cambridge, Mass., will address the school on Mexico in the near future.

Miss Mary N. Chase, Andover, N. H., will be pleased to answer any inquiries regarding this important movement to promote friendly relations with Mexico, a country that, inasmuch as it is facing an election of a president, is now in a specially tense condition of conflict. To this a peril from civil war by Sonora's secession threatens.

BOOK REVIEWS

BEFORE THE WAR. By *Viscount Haldane*, K. T., O. M. Funk and Wagnalls, New York City. Pp. 223.

This Scotch metaphysician, jurist, and man of affairs, eminent in British political life as a Liberal of the older type, but who is now showing unpredicted sympathy for a new Labor party, served as Secretary of State for War from 1905 to 1912, and was Lord High Chancellor from 1912 to 1915. To him the British people owed a territorial army, which if they had not had it during August and September, 1914, and been able to place it with dispatch and full force on the Continent, Germany probably would have captured Paris.

Because of his statesmanlike handling of the British military "preparedness" policy in pre-war days, Lord Haldane came to know much about the national foreign policy and its bearings upon possible German military aggression. His personal preference as a student and thinker had brought him intimately in contact with the higher ranges of German thought and had won for him recognition in the German academic world. Thus equipped, he was the natural choice of the British Government for those quasi-official, tentative, personally executed commissions to Berlin which were common during the last years of the last century and the early years of this century.

The serious British endeavor, as Viscount Haldane makes clear in this book, was to come to an understanding with Germany respecting growth of naval power, satisfaction of the Teutonic desire for a "place in the sun," and establishing of a *modus vivendi* by which the two rival nations might avoid war while satisfying legitimate national aspirations.

This book is the narrative, mainly, of these negotiations, and because the story comes from a chief actor in the play that turned out to be a tragedy, it is the more valuable.

During the early stages of the war Viscount Haldane had to suffer misunderstandings and some measure of journalistic denunciation, because in pre-war days he had been a champion of Anglo-German friendship. He was, and he still is, such a champion. In the epilogue of this book he pleads for a treatment of the Central Powers that while just will not be of a kind to insure coming hostilities. To forget may be impossible; but to forgive need not be, providing it is preceded by signs of contrition and fruits meet for repentance by Germany and Austria.

OUR WAR WITH GERMANY—A HISTORY. By *John Spencer Bassett*. Alfred A. Knopf. New York. Pp. 378.

Professor Bassett is known to students of American history as the competent author of excellent works on "The Federalist System," "The Middle Group of American Historians," and a life of Andrew Jackson. In his book, "The Lost Fruits of Waterloo," he branched out into a study of European history that at once indicated that he could master the intricacies of military and diplomatic maneuverings and the remote as well as the immediate consequences of historic events.

In this history of the War of 1914-18, "The World War," he has done his work well, but fully aware that he is basing his conclusions on partial data. He has had a popular rather than a learned audience chiefly in mind, deeming it best, doubtless, to make his chronicle one that the American citizen who still reads books can understand and also find some satisfaction in reading. He has tried to be fair, as becometh a scholar, and to deal with matters now in controversy with as much objectivity as is possible.

The swift process of time since August, 1914, with its unprecedented happenings, violent alternations of fear and hope, mobilization and dispersion of hosts of men, arraying of peoples as well as of armies against each other, and the delays, intricacies, disillusionments, and passions of the peace negotiations and treaty-making process, has wrought in most of his countrymen a present state of mind that is chaotic, contemporary, and comparatively unmindful of what has gone before. To such this book comes as a God-send to recall past states of emotion and conviction. By it they can stabilize themselves somewhat and recall where they were, so as to better understand where and why they

are where they are. Even the author admits his inability to keep a true perspective in such a welter of mixed motives (political, partisan, national, racial, and religious) as faces the chronicler. But his main conclusions are such as to make for optimism so far as the American record and the American program are concerned. Our nation has been right and, as he believes, our national acts also, at least down to the opening of the Peace Conference. Beyond that period he does not go with his judgment, though his chronicle covers presentation of the treaty to the Senate.

LAW IN THE MODERN STATE. By *Leon Duguit*. Introduction by *Harold Laski*. B. W. Huebsch. New York City. Pp. 245. \$2.50.

The Harvard University professor, who has acted as co-translator with his wife in making this book accessible to an English-reading public and who also writes the introduction, is himself an exponent of the dynamic theory of law's and government's evolution which the eminent French jurist among his contemporaries stands for pre-eminently. The value of Mr. Laski's introduction is his relation of the French theory to the views of American and British thinkers who, coming at the subject in a less doctrinaire and more practical way, are arriving at the same conclusions. Conspicuous among Americans so inclined are Mr. Justice Holmes, of the Supreme Court, and Dean Roscoe Pound, of the Harvard Law School, and Mr. Herbert Croly, of the New Republic.

Whether American, British, or French, the "school" holds that the older theory of representative government has broken down, and that law and government must adjust themselves to community (large or small) aspirations that cannot longer be expressed in terms purely political. Economic federalism looms on the horizon as a theory, held by many of the younger political scientists and jurists. It also is a practical fact because of the Russian revolution and the emergence of the new type of society which has followed. The State hereafter, they say, must be interpreted in terms of sociology or social interdependence. The sovereignty and personality of the State are denied. Rights as such are minimized or ignored; emphasis is put on duties. Statutes are simply legislative determination of functions to be done by individuals to serve a public need. Administrative acts are simply the fulfillment of statutes. In short, to quote Duguit, a "realistic and socialized legal system replaces an earlier system that was at once abstract and individualist in character." "If man has rights, he can only have them from his social environment; he cannot impose his rights upon it." Any ruling class, therefore, present or future, has "no subjective sovereignty. It has a power which it exerts in return for the organization of those public services which are consistently to respond to the public need. Its acts have neither force nor legal value save as they contribute to this end. . . . The State is no longer a sovereign power issuing its commands. It is a group of individuals who must use the force they possess to supply the public need."

Which is precisely the argument that Treitsche used in defense of his group in Germany, and that Lenin is now using in Russia to back up his group.

LIBERALISM IN AMERICA. ITS ORIGIN, ITS CONTEMPORARY COLLAPSE, ITS FUTURE. By *Harold Stearns*. Boni and Liveright, New York City. Pp. 232. \$1.75.

Mr. Stearns formerly aided in editing *The Dial*, in its New York days, when it was competing with *The New Republic* and *The Nation* as an organ of dissent. He is of a group of young Americans of unquestioned American lineage who are competing with the Jewish-American "intellectuals" in efforts to make the New America quite different from the Old. But Mr. Stearns, like Mr. Croly, of *The New Republic*, is an evolutionist, not a revolutionist; a liberal, not a radical; and he is quite satisfied with the theory of the older Liberalism of Europe and the United States, but finds fault with its present strategy and tactics.

Being this sort of a "reformer," he finds himself lonesome today, facing the attack on individualism and on individual "rights" which comes from the doctrinaire socialist, and also from the pragmatic citizen who likes prohibition because it

works well, who economically defends conscription because it "was inevitable," and who decides all issues of the hour in the light of "public interest" defined by a majority.

There is much in this book dealing with conscription and the psychological aspects of "patriotism" and war which a pacifist of the older type will do well to read. On the whole, he will be established in his former faith that there are "concepts of justice, liberty, and regard for truth itself" which do not change with the generations. He will discover in its author a trenchant critic of militarism, of compromise in affairs of State, and of the arrogance of "intellectuals," whether liberal or otherwise.

FRANCE AND OURSELVES. INTERPRETATIVE STUDIES, 1917-1919. By *Herbert Adams Gibbon*. The Century Co., N. Y. City. Pp. 286. \$1.50.

Written for American, English, and French periodicals, these studies of France, of French statesmen, and of the foreign relations of France, especially with the United States, have a unity of spirit commendable in the author. He is a believer in France, quite candid in expressing his love, and equally free in reproving his countrymen or warning them against offences against France and Frenchmen.

THE SPIRIT OF SELECTIVE SERVICE. By *Maj. Gen. E. H. Crowder, U. S. A., Provost Marshal General*. The Century Co., N. Y. Pp. 367. \$2.00.

The marvel of mobilization of the World War undoubtedly was the creation of the army of the United States, numbering more than 4,000,000 men, and the despatching of half of them across the Atlantic to the seat of war. To our Associated Powers as well as to the Central Powers, it was the "feat magnificent," for which they were not prepared. Basically, so far as law and morals went, it was made possible by what General Crowder in this book politely calls the "selective service," not caring to use the word draft or the term "compulsory military training." To him, as a long-time student of the many systems of compulsory military service in use in Europe and also as master of the art of organization and execution of military policies, naturally fell the task of drafting the law passed by Congress, which was carried into execution by the War Department and its army of civilian aides in the local communities.

As a definitive statement of the record achieved, the methods used, and the aims kept in mind, this book will be read far and wide, in Europe and Asia as well as in this country. The author, however, is not content with looking around him and backward. He looks ahead and finds in the democratization of the people who were drafted, in their unity of purpose in a common privileged task, and in the mutual understandings set up by enforced contacts of the army, lessons for the citizenship of the country in times of peace. His vague ideals thus voiced are not given very concrete expression; but the man's pride in his administrative achievement during the war is so deeply rooted in his consciousness that he can readily posit his hopes for a better world on imitation of the "selective service ideal." A person able to look at the mobilization of the army more objectively might well hesitate about "wishing" the process of compulsory service upon normal civilian life. General Crowder admits that the relatively small amount of resistance to the act was due to a mood of national exaltation and moral elevation. It was not based on any change of fundamental attitude, rational in its origin. The moral passion has passed, as national morale has slumped following the armistice, and the plan for compulsory military training of the youth of the country in times of peace is being resolutely fought in Congress.

A HANDBOOK TO THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS. By *Sir Geoffrey Butler*, with an introduction by Rt. Hon. Lord Robert Cecil. Longmans, Green & Co., N. Y. City. Pp. 80. \$1.75 net.

The official relation which the author of this quasi-official book bears to the League of Nations, of which Sir Eric

Drummond is secretary, makes it valuable as a statement of the mechanism of the Paris Treaty and League Covenant, as a text of the document, and as a commentary upon it. It shows how the League's officials are beginning to interpret their duties. Written by an Englishman, primarily for Britons, it naturally, though not defensibly, ignores American aspects of the situation; it makes little or no reference to American writers on international law, and it cites practically no American thinkers or doers in the field of international jurisprudence and arbitration. Mr. Butler is an undersecretary of the League and officiated as such at the International Labor Conference in Washington.

PARLIAMENT AND REVOLUTION. By *J. Ramsay Macdonald*. Scott & Seltzer, New York City. Pp. 180. \$1.50 net.

This is the first of a series in a new Library of Social Science which this new firm will publish. In it the distinguished leader of British labor argues against the dictatorship and centralized, autocratic form of government which Lenin and Trotsky preach and practice. In it he urges on the powerful social group, which he teaches the merits of a representative form of democracy adapted to contemporary needs and political demands. His theory is that "the Socialist movement, on account of the complexity of the problems it raises, of the unexplored regions of conduct which it has to traverse, of the assumptions which it has to make because experience has not been acquired, is of all movements the one which ought never to lose a footing on reality while it stretches out to attain an ideal, one which ought never to lose balance in its progressive efforts."

He is frank enough to confess that "the mass mind can be moved by the highest moral idealism and at the same time be inflamed by the blindest passions. It is both absurdly generous and brutally cruel; it is non-rational and irresponsible; it is blind to contradictions and inconsistencies because emotion is not a continuous process of the intelligence, but a response to passing and temporary influences; it is a continual condition of self-flattery."

For proof of this he points to the post-war reactions of Great Britain under the spell of Lloyd-George, which swept into the national lawmaking body at the last election such a reactionary, conservative majority. He argues for the "evolutionary movement of the constructive reason" at a time when war has destroyed the social *status quo*. He wants labor to be wise enough to seize this opportunity to make "organic social change." He wants the democracy of tomorrow to have a higher conception of its duty than to merely subject capitalism to punishment and extinction. He wants no rule of "proletarian tyranny preliminary to a reign of liberty." He has no more sympathy with property tests for the franchise than he has for educational, religious, age, or military tests for the same privilege.

For him the Soviet system of democracy is inferior to the British, because "it is a pyramid of local governing authorities topped by what is to all intents and purposes a national executive, whereas the parliamentary system is directly based upon national opinion and gives validity to numerous municipal administrative bodies." The Russian form is indirect; the British direct. One is national; the other parochial.

This book, read in connection with the one by the French thinker Duguit, also reviewed in this issue of the *ADVOCATE*, is interesting because of its discussion of the territorial *vs.* trade theory of representation in parliamentary bodies. Macdonald is against a change because "society is greater than any industry; every industry exists only in relation to every other industry; the complete economic unity must always be considered." Nevertheless, he admits the faults of the representative system based on the territorial unit; and his solution is a second chamber, based on the Soviet theory of the franchise, that is an upper house representing groups.

A more searching discussion from the practical standpoint of a man whose theories do not run ahead of the facts of life has not been written in English for persons who wish to understand why the British democracy is not to follow the Russian methods or theories.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM SECTION FOR THE UNITED STATES (Formerly Woman's Peace Party)

OBJECT.

To organize support for the resolutions passed at the Women's International Congress at The Hague in 1915 and in Zurich in 1919, and to support movements to further Peace, Internationalism, and the Freedom of Women.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Miss Jane Addams, President, U. S. A.
Miss Emily G. Balch, Secretary-Treasurer, U. S. A.
Mme. Gabrielle Duchene, France.
Mlle. Marguerite Gobat, Switzerland.
Frau Yella Hertzka, Austria.
Frl. Lida Gustava Heymann, Germany.
Frl. Martha Larsen, Norway.
Miss Chrystal Macmillan, Great Britain.
Mme. C. Ramondt-Hirschmann, Holland.
Mrs. H. M. Swanwick, Great Britain.

Consultative Members, Executive Committee, Section for U. S. A.:

Miss Grace Abbott, Illinois.
Miss Lillian D. Wald, New York.

International Office, 19 Bd Georges-Favon, Geneva, Switzerland.

NATIONAL SECTIONS.

Australia.	India (British).
Austria.	Ireland.
Belgium.	Italy.
Bulgaria.	Netherlands.
Canada.	New Zealand.
Denmark.	Norway.
Finland.	Poland.
France.	Sweden.
Germany.	Switzerland.
Great Britain.	United States.
Hungary.	

GENERAL OBJECTS.

To promote methods for the attainment of that peace between nations which is based on justice and good-will and to co-operate with women from other countries who are working for the same ends.

SPECIAL OBJECTS.

Those indicated by the standing committees and for immediate action to oppose universal compulsory military training; to oppose all invasions of constitutional rights, free speech, free press, and assembly and minority representation in legislative bodies; to oppose invasion of Mexico for purposes of war; to work to amend the League of Nations Covenant, if it is ratified by the United States, and if not so ratified, to secure a true Concert of Nations to substitute Law for War.

OFFICERS.

Chairman:

Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer, White Plains, N. Y.

Honorary Chairman:

Miss Jane Addams, Chicago, Ill.

Secretary:

Mrs. Lucy Biddle Lewis, Lansdowne, Pa.

Treasurer:

Mrs. Hannah Clothier Hull, Swarthmore, Pa.

Vice-Chairmen:

Miss S. P. Breckinridge, Illinois.
Mrs. C. E. Cumberson, California.
Miss Zona Gale, Wisconsin.
Mrs. Harriet P. Thomas, Florida.
Miss Jeannette Rankin, Montana.
Mrs. A. N. Winslow, Massachusetts.

Members of the Executive Committee:

Mrs. William Jennings Bryan, Nebraska.
Mrs. Walter Cope, Pennsylvania.
Miss Helena Dudley, Massachusetts.
Mrs. Frederick Holt, Michigan.
Mrs. David Starr Jordan, California.
Mrs. Eleanor Daggett Karsten, New York.
Mrs. Florence Kelley, New York.
Mrs. William Kent, California.
Mrs. Anna Rhoads Ladd, Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Henry G. Leach, New York.
Mrs. Lola Maverick Lloyd, Illinois.
Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead, Massachusetts.
Miss Rose Standish Nichols, Massachusetts.
Mrs. George Odell, Washington, D. C.
Miss Juliet Poyntz, New York.
Mrs. Frederick J. Taussig, Missouri.
Mrs. Mary Church Terrell, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. John Jay White, Washington, D. C.
Miss Ellen Winsor, Pennsylvania.

Standing Committees:

Fight the Famine Crusade.
Education: Subcommittee on Physical Education.
League of Nations.
Oriental Relations.
Universal Free Trade.
Citizenship: To Permeate the Americanization Movement with the Spirit of Internationalism.
Pan American Relations.
Labor.
Legislation: Chairman, Mrs. George Odell, 1623 H Street, Washington, D. C.
Finance: Chairman, Mrs. Marion B. Cothren, 144 East 40th Street, New York City.

All American women are urged to join this Section for U. S. A. of the Women's International League by use of the appended slip.

Date

I hereby enclose one dollar for membership in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Section for U. S. A., for the year 1920.

Name

Address

Make checks payable to W. I. L. P. F., Section for U. S. A., and send to Eleanor Daggett Karsten, Executive Secretary, Room 1616, 33 West 42nd Street, New York City.

(Adv.)

